THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE
EVOLUTION AND MAN
NATURAL MORALITY
AND OTHER ESSAYS

BY WOOD SMITH MESSER

Class BL2775

Book .M68

PRESENTED BY

_____

EVOLUTION AND MAN
NATURAL MORALITY
THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE
AND OTHER ESSAYS

BY

ELWOOD SMITH MOSER

COLLEGEVILLE, PA.

1919

BL2775
.M68

Gift
H. L. Mencken
June 20, 1937

TO THE MEMORY

OF

MY DEPARTED SON

LIEUTENANT

FREDERICK LeROY MOSER

CONTENTS

	Page
Fundamental Conceptions	1
Nature	9
Is There Design in Nature?	10
Cause and Effect	15
Evolution	17
The Universe	21
The Solar System	24
The Earth	28
Life	35
Evolution and Man	38
Matter and Mind	51
Natural Morality	55
Reason and Morals	62
Materialism	66
Reflections Upon Human Existence	70
Science	73
Theology the Foe of Human Progress	81
Religion	103
Why Belief?	122
Why Unbelief?	128
The Church of the Future	148
Ideas of God	170
Immortality	177
Education	186
Government	192

INTRODUCTION

It is the serious duty of every rational human being to help make the earth a better and happier abiding place. This duty is imposed by the very nature of human existence — by the constructive and destructive influences which determine the weal and woe of humanity, individually and collectively. Knowledge, however circumscribed, pertaining to these natural influences, enabled primitive man to devise crude, though effective, ways of obtaining subsistence, and to defend himself against enemies threatening his well-being and his life. His participation in evolutionary processes resulted in contributions to the advancement that culminated, through successive generations, in civilizations more than a hundred thousand years later. Without these contributions evolutionary progress, humanly speaking, would have been impossible. In his struggle for existence, in his constructive efforts, man of the twentieth century encounters the same destructive influences, manifested in quite different ways, which beset his remote ancestors. Effects have always been just equal to the causes producing them; always will be. Those who hope to escape by chance the logical effects of causes deceive themselves and sooner or later pay the penalty of self-deception.

Ignorance, credulity, injustice, intolerance and dishonesty continue to be prominent and potent among the destructive influences which interpose serious obstacles and dangers to the progress and safety of modern society. Our much-vaunted civilization, with its artificialities, shams, pretenses and immoralities beclouds

the intellectual and moral vision and impairs those discernments which distinguish the always existing differences between constructive and destructive agencies. The complexities of the twentieth century are eliminative of the simplicities of life and disregardful of the common though significant and potential facts of human existence. Destructive influences persist within the weakest parts of society, as they do within the vulnerable human organism. Diseases sap the vitality and destroy the lives of individuals. Social diseases weaken and endanger the life of society. The civilization of the present, in its totality, is heading either toward a period of constructive betterment, or toward one of retrogression and ultimate disaster. It must proceed one way or the other. It cannot, as a whole, move in both directions in the same period of time.

The progress of civilization requires the exercise of the same constructive influences which produce uprightness of character in the individual units of society. Therefore, the varying standards of civilization, or of society, are determined by the average intellectual and moral status of a majority of its individual units. When the average attained by the majority is relatively high and stable civilization is safe; otherwise it is in danger.

Observation, investigation and reflection concerning the more serious problems of human existence, which have engaged a part of my time and attention for more than forty years, have strengthened within me the sincere and unalterable conviction that the permanent welfare and highest destiny of mankind can be obtained only by:

First—the general and thorough application of the natural principles of Truth, Justice and Morality, and the universal exercise of Rightful Human Liberty.

Second—the educational enlightenment which exerts its influence toward the full enthronement of Reason and the wide and effective dissemination of the verified and constructive facts of science relating to all the known phenomena of Nature.

Those who directly or indirectly oppose the complete enthronement of reason and the exaltation of truth revealed by thoroughly tested facts are the destructive enemies of humanity, because the reasoning function is of first importance in the maintenance of man at the apex of organic life, and because truth makes for rightful freedom and exact justice. Divested of reason, man falls below all other species of animals in impotence and helplessness. Notwithstanding this fact many of the activities of our race are influenced more by emotional and irrational impulses than by rational considerations. Consequently, it frequently happens that the emotions of even so-termed educated persons preclude the formation of rationally sound conclusions. The larger portion of humanity continues to be inclined strongly to think by proxy and to remain under the control of those actuated by destructive as well as by constructive influences—by lofty motives or by base and ignoble purposes. Incoherent thinking, in considerable part due to defective intellectual and moral training, or to the need of true enlightenment, is very largely responsible for the preponderating defects of the units of society. This fact cannot be disguised by the veneerings and shams of egoism and the complacency of self-satisfied claimants who presumptiously assert authority and aim to regulate sundry affairs of humanity upon the basis of conclusions following false or defective premises regarding man's place in Nature.

The central and controlling purpose prompting the

preparation of this volume of essays is to contribute effort in the direction of stimulating earnest enquiry and reflective thought respecting problems of the most serious import for the well-being of humanity. I venture to hope that the contents of this volume will be subjected to critical analysis at the bar of reason and factual evidence, and I trust the merits and demerits of the various essays will be judged accordingly. No attempt has been made to exhaust the subjects treated. In a number of instances some fundamental principles and basic lines are indicated. Details related thereto are not difficult of access to those who may desire additional information.

In acknowledgment of data derived from various sources and incorporated in several of the essays mention is here appreciatively made of the "Miracles of Science" by Dr. Henry Smith Williams; "A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology" by Dr. Andrew Dickson White, late President of Cornell University; "History of Gods and Religions of Ancient and Modern Times" by D. M. Bennett; "The Bible" and "The Christ" by John E. Remsburg; and the "Belief in God and Immortality" by James H. Leuba.

E. S. M.

FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTIONS

How came the earth, other inhabitants of space, and man? This profound and awe-inspiring problem prompts the serious attention of mankind. It is, obviously, invested with absorbing interest and portentious significance; it arouses the deepest emotions, invites the wildest and wierdest flights of imagination, and entrances the most powerful intellects. Man is ever impelled by the impulses of his sensory organs to feel, observe, hear, and so forth; to strive to account for his own and other existences, and thus obtain a more or less satisfactory solution of the problem. Two avenues have been and continue to be open to him. The one is that of alluring conjecture; the other is that of rational explanation supported by the findings of science. He cannot, simultaneously, traverse both. Though he may pass from one to the other, he habitually frequents the one that harmonizes with his conjectural cogitations, or, the one conclusively in accord with rational, verified evidence. Conjectural and vagaristic solutions continue to largely dominate the masses of mankind because of the preponderance of emotional influences and mere conjectures supported by influential propagandists. Moreover, the human race, as a whole, is neither accustomed nor inclined to reason clearly and definitely respecting the deeper problems that rivet the enquiring thought of mankind.

In the avenue of rational investigation certain fundamental conceptions have come to be recognized as constituting the basis for the superstructure of science, and the philosophy of scientific evidence, by those who would attain an intelligible and coherent solution of the problem relating to the origin of the earth, other inhabitants of space, and man. Since the following conceptions bear either direct or indirect relation to the subjects discussed in this volume of essays, it is of importance that they be thoughtfully considered:

SPACE: Uncreatable; infinite in its extensions.

TIME: Uncreatable; infinite in duration.

MATTER: Self-existent, indestructible, eternal.

SPACE AND TIME

Fundamental conceptions respecting space and time necessitate certain definite considerations. Though it is apparently true that the human mind cannot comprehend space in its infinity, it is also true that the mind is utterly incapable of conceiving limitations to space in its extensions. It is just so with time in its infiniteness in duration. Therefore, the conception of infinite time is conclusive. To attempt to conceive of boundaries to space or of a beginning or ending of time is to pave the way that leads to final considerations respecting the irresistible conceptions of illimitable space and unending time. The fundamental conceptions of time and space in nowise interfere with such measurements and divisions of time as have been, or may be, found necessary for the convenient regulation of various affairs of mankind. Thus, our day of twenty-four hours denotes a period or portion of time about equivalent to that required for the earth to make one revolution upon its axis. The reduction of hours to minutes and seconds, or fractional parts thereof, is

indicative not of limitations to infinite time, but merely of limitational divisions of time to meet human requirements. The measurements and divisions of space within humanly convenient limitations in no way conflict with the fundamental conception of space as being infinite in its extensions.

The concepts of space and time are independent or exclusive of the conception of matter. That is to say, it is not difficult to conceive of space and time as being apart from the existence of, and in no wise depending upon, matter and its movements. Locke has well said that "Pure space is capable of neither resistance nor motion.

MATTER

Matter, or substance, is something in motion—eternally in motion; motion resulting in ever changing positions of moving matter in space and time. Since it is impossible for a single particle of matter to move in more than one direction in a fractional part of space and time, all variations in the direction of movement must result in describing a definite number of straight lines.

Matter may also be conceived as something in clear contradistinction to nothing; nothing being the absence of something. The self-existence of matter, and the eternity of its existence, is postulated because of its indestructibility. The conversion of something into nothing, or of nothing into something, is unthinkable. It has been proven by thousands of chemical experiments that matter cannot be destroyed. That which cannot be destroyed cannot be originated; it can neither be increased nor decreased; its indestructibility clearly implies the impossibility of its creation. Matter is eternal in existence and motion.

Primarily, matter can do but two things: occupy space and move. The resultants of its simple and complex movements are: Change of position in space and

time and change of form—forms, representing elemental combinations of matter, being invariably the resultants of similar or varying arrangements or combinations of individual particles. All forms of matter are relatively unstable and transient; always subject to the processes of disintegration and re-formation.

Every phenomenon of Nature is obviously the resultant of definite movements of matter, since no phenomenon can be rationally cognized as unrelated to the causative effect of the movement of matter.

Matter in its movements is constructive and destructive—synthetical and analytical—respecting all forms or collocations, whatsoever.

The conception that vacant space must exist between every particle—however infinitesimal—of matter, seems to be entirely tenable. The vibratory movements of every particle of matter in space clearly implies the existence of vacant space. The compressibility of matter, well known to physicists, also sustains the conception that all the movements of matter require the existence of unoccupied space. The "imponderable space-filling ether" predicated by some thinkers invites the consideration that "imponderable ether" must either be composed of individual particles of very attenuated matter, free to move; or nothing.

Before proceeding with additional considerations respecting matter and its movements, it is of importance that reference be made to that which is widely designated as force:

I am impelled to define force (or energy) as an attribute of, and not as an existing entity separate and apart from, matter; to regard the totality of force in any given mass or collocation of matter as just equal to the sum of the vibratory movements of its component particles, and, to consider the force exerted by any particle or mass of matter upon other particles

or masses as being determined by their respective attractions or repulsions. The potent influences associated with the attraction and repulsion of particles and masses of matter—forever moving in space and time—are the resulting causes-efficient in the formation of all combinations of matter, inorganic and organic.

The attractive force of any mass of matter in space, be it sun or planet, is determined by its density, weight, rapidity of revolution upon its axis, and its distance from other masses. To illustrate: Consider the earth and its nearest neighbor and satellite, the moon. The earth, being the larger and heavier body, attracts (or pulls) the moon a greater distance earthward than the moon attracts the earth toward that reflector of the light of the sun. It is to be noted in passing that both the earth and moon are not only subject to their own reciprocal attractions, but also to all the attractive influences of the masses of the solar system; and the solar system is likewise influenced in the totality of its movements by all other masses of matter in movement throughout the universe.

Matter in motion evolves solar systems—suns, planets and all other masses in absolute accord with unchangeable mathematical principles or modes of movement. Matter with its pull and push necessitously forms the most simple inorganic aggregation of particles, as well as the most complex organic structures. Thus, matter in movement, formed all existing suns and planets and smaller masses in space, and moving matter is manifested by the attenuated, incandescent, nebulous matter of future suns and planets. Again, matter in complexity of movement and atomic-molecular structure is phenomenally revealed by the brain of man.

The movements of matter, always along lines of least resistance, result in eternally integrating and dis-

integrating aggregations or masses of matter. These movements, as involved in the formation, life, death, disintegration, and rebirth of solar systems and planets, require periods of inconceivable duration.

Until recent times the generally accepted conception of the ultimate unit of matter was the atom, the chief feature of Dalton's treatise on chemistry being that the atoms of the same element are exactly alike in mass and other properties, though different from the atoms of any other kind of element. The more modern conception of the ultimate unit is the electron; no less a material conception than the atom of matter. The electron is defined "as the smallest existence known capable of isolation and free movement through space." It is estimated as having one thousandth of the mass of a hydrogen atom—the hydrogen atom being the lightest among all the chemical units. The present conception of physicists appears to strongly favor the conclusion that the ultimate unit of matter, in its last analysis, is electrical in character. Augusto Righi, of the University of Bologna, in treating of the constitution of matter in his "Modern Theory of Physical Phenomena," says: * * * "Therefore it may be admitted that a material atom is nothing but a system consisting of a certain number of positive and an equal number of negative electrons, and that the latter, or at least some of them, move about the remaining portion like satellites. Molecular and atomic forces would then be nothing but the manifestations of the electromagnetic forces of the electrons, and gravitation itself might be explained with these concepts as a basis. In fact, this has already been attempted. If we suppose one or more negative electrons to be taken away from an atom, it becomes a positive ion, while the addition of one of more negative electrons to a neutral atom produces a negative ion. * * * The

electrons would seem to be, therefore, the elements of construction in the architecture of the atoms."

The eternal movements of matter involve homogeneous (simple) and heterogeneous (complex) elemental combinations in orderly sequence—from homogeneity to heterogeneity, and from heterogeneity to homogeneity; from nebulous matter to suns and planets, from inorganic combinations of matter to living organisms. The everlasting processes revealed by the simple and complex movements of matter—constructive (synthetical) and destructive (analytical) constitute the cause-efficient of all forms of matter, inanimate and animate, in existence in boundless space and infinite time.

The highest known form of inorganic matter is that of the diamond, which exhibits the arrangement of similar atoms (carbon) in definite, mathematical order. Diamonds were formed in the formative period of the earth, under conditions requiring great heat and pressure. Pure coal is also composed of atoms of carbon. What a vast difference in atomic arrangement! On the other hand, the highest form of organic matter is the brain of man, a collocation of complex, differentiated and co-ordinating cells derived from simple protoplasm—the basis of all vegetable and organic life.

Matter in masses (largeness) and matter in its smallness and indivisibility—representing the macrocosm and microcosm of the universe—transcends the comprehension of man. Knowledge respecting the constitution of matter and the phenomena caused by its movements is derived from critical analyses and comparisons of observational data within varying limits. These limits have been extended from time to time, yet infinity lies beyond, in a macrocosmic and microcosmic sense. However, within the boundaries noted man has formulated conceptions through which

are comprehended certain definite, orderly, mathematical processes of matter in motion, simple and complex, and in so far as these conceptions are verified by numerous similar observations they clearly, inductively, and unmistakably support the conclusion that the processes of matter in motion throughout the universe, and beyond, are universally identical in character. Moreover, such verified conceptions are found to be absolutely dependable as instrumentalities of vast and benign import to mankind.

NATURE

THE TERM NATURE COMPREHENDS THE PROCESSES OF MATTER IN MOTION THROUGHOUT THE UNIVERSE IN ACCORD WITH ETERNALLY FIXED PRINCIPLES OR MODES OF MOVEMENT. THE PHENOMENA OF NATURE ARE SEQUENCES OR EXPRESSIONS OF THE ACTIVITIES OF COLLOCATIONS OF MATTER.

THE EXISTENCE OF THE SUPERNATURAL, OF A POWER BEYOND OR EXTRANEOUS TO NATURE IS NOT ADMISSABLE FROM THE VIEW-POINT OF DEMONSTRABLE EVIDENCE BASED UPON ALL THE VERIFIED FACTS THUS FAR WITHIN REACH OF HUMAN UNDERSTANDING.

MAN KNOWS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ABOUT THE SUPERNATURAL, KNOWS NOT ANYTHING WITH RELATION TO ANYTHING THAT MAY TRANSCEND NATURE, AS PHENOMENALLY MANIFESTED BY MATTER IN MOTION, AS COGNIZED BY THE SENSORY ORGANS OF MAN AND OTHER ANIMALS. THOSE WHO AFFIRM THE EXISTENCE OF THE SUPERNATURAL ARE OUTSIDE THE REALM OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF FACTS—BEYOND KNOWN TRUTH. SUCH AFFIRMATION IS PURE CONJECTURE. CONJECTURE IS NOT EVIDENCE. MERE FANTASIES OF THE BRAIN OF MAN MAY BE PLEASUREABLE, BUT THEY ARE NOT RELIABLE. FREQUENTLY THEY ARE DANGEROUS, AND THEREFORE TO BE DISTRUSTED.

THE BOOK OF NATURE IS OPEN TO ALL WHO CHOOSE TO STUDY ITS PAGES AND GAIN WISDOM AND UNDERSTANDING.

IS THERE DESIGN IN NATURE?

> Design is introduced into the world by the reflecting reason, which thereafter is startled by a miracle of its own creation.—KANT.

Is there design in Nature? That is, are the operations of Nature—to which the infinite variety of phenomena presented to the senses are due—in accordance with designs previously, or from time to time, decreed by an omnipresent, superintending Intelligence; the intelligence of a supreme being or architect of the universe?

Even many persons who are inclined to think seriously upon the problem of existence and attending whys and wherefores are inclined to entertain the idea of a designer. The apparent adaption of means to ends revealed by the multiplied phenomena arising from natural processes is easily assumed to be the outcome of divine wisdom, previous design, or present interposition; the fruition of "purposes of divine origin." Though the diverging views entertained upon the question of design—where it begins and where it ends—are manifold, the leaders of metaphysical thought (theologians included) are agreed—however vague their conceptions—that in some mysterious way all the affairs of this world are regulated and controlled by a personal (anthropomorphic) God, endowed with enlarged human attributes. There are others who pos-

tulate that designing intelligence is not involved in any personal sense whatever; that such intelligence pervades the material world as a "spirit-factor" and designer.

Omitting what would be a wholly futile attempt to imagine the infinite physical proportions of an anthropomorphic designer, or an attempt to define just what is meant by "spirit," I respectfully present the following considerations for the thoughtful consideration of readers:

Necessity—inherent in the inexorable relationship existing between cause and effect respecting every phenomenon which the senses take cognizance of, obviously negatives the assumption with regard to either a personal or impersonal designer. Water does not seek its level, the tides do not ebb and flow, the earth does not revolve upon its axis or describe its orbit in space, nor does the sun shine, or the moon reflect the light of the sun—in accordance with the designs of a personal or super-personal agency; for in every instance the necessity for the manifestations of the phenomena referred to is inherently involved in the self-determined movements of matter. Necessity is the all-sufficient factor involved in the orderly succession of causes and effects. It would therefore seem entirely clear that the interposition of design, general or special, is a superfluous procedure, and that the assumption of any such agency arises from comparisons based upon false and untenable premises.

The unyielding necessity inherent in the mathematical precision of all natural operations has impelled organisms of higher and lower development to distinguish differences everywhere about them, and to discern more or less clearly some of the relationships involved. The same necessity has given rise to special individual effort to cling tenaciously to things of ad-

vantage to the individual in the inexorable struggle for existence. In the natural operations or processes, always efficiently involved in the development of the individual, human design, intention, or purpose came to be recognized as an important factor in determining and directing the actions of men. As he did not appreciate natural processes resulting in human design or purpose, nor take into account that desires, designs and purposes are invariably the resultants of conditions or states of brain matter, it is not surprising that earlier man should, in the absence of scientific data, imaginatively personify, with enlarged human attributes, the greater power perceived about him. It was observed that by doing certain things certain results would follow; by observing multifarious phenomena of Nature man concluded that "God" designed and caused all that he saw—all that his senses took cognizance of; that it was "God's will" that water courses down hill, that men live and die. In later times (though the childhood of the human race, as a whole, has not yet passed) the imagination and artistic ingenuity of metaphysicians has applied to the theory of design many attractive colors to invite the attention, worship, and adoration, of the multitudes. Even now, many supporters of the theory of supernatural design, essaying much wisdom from on high, and professing a considerable knowledge of the affairs of life, and laying claim to scientific information, will point to some specific development, animal or vegetable, as typifying in organic structure and function unquestionable evidences of design and of the existence of a designer. What they affirm is readily assented to, without thought or investigation, by others.

Let us consider a few facts in relation to man—the highest developed organism—concerning the theory of design: From protoplasmic units, elaborated

from simple elementary substances, to the monera, and from monera to man, there has been evolved an orderly succession of changes, and every change along the entire line of development from the simple to the complex in physical structure stands for a series of effects just equal to the casues producing them. Furthermore every change in the various forms or collocations of matter has been wholly due to potential (inherent) energy, and energy (environmental) from without. The advocate of design may interpose this argument: "Is not the very action, per se, referred to, in keeping with a comprehensive theory of design? The answer is, no; for the all-sufficient reason that the introduction of design, apart from being superfluous and useless in arriving at a relatively accurate solution of the great problems of organic development, only adds another element to explain, and therefore obscures scientific investigation. Furthermore, propositions supported only by mere assumptions must be ruled out as evidence. Particles of matter attract and repel each other because they can behave in no other way, and no designing intelligence can vary natural, mathematical modes of material action. Moreover, the introduction of design throws upon its claimants the burden of explaining or illustrating the relative nature and character of the designer, and of showing how the primary and other movements of matter could not be sustained in the absence of such designer.

It is frequently urged in criticism against those who have devoted the best years of their lives to the investigation of natural phenomena that they are guilty of "attempting to put God out of the world," and of endeavoring to set aside the purposiveness of will represented in a divine plan! The searchers after truths inhering in Nature have had and have no such object

in view. They have followed and continue to follow where indisputable evidence leads the way. They have impartially and with no disrespect analyzed the claims of anthropomorphists and spiritists. Thus far they have been entirely unable to find or discern the need of purposive design, and all they do know from relatively conclusive evidence flatly contradicts the assumption of the existence of such design.

An earnest and well-meaning disciple of the theory of design may interrogate: "Where does man's responsibility rest under your process of reasoning?" And where I rejoin, does man's "responsibility rest under" your assumptions. Carry your theory of design to its logical conclusion and all the acts of every human being are just what they are designed to be, and can be nothing else—notwithstanding the assumption of "free-will." From the rational viewpoint, there is much to expect and hope for in the ascertainment of knowledge as to the natural, orderly processes concerning the origin and evolutionary development of the human organism. Obviously so, for by cognizing Nature's modes of multifarious movement, however complex, human knowledge has been, and is being, turned to vast practical account in elevating and substantially bettering human conditions and establishing **man's responsibility to man,** without assuming the least modification of a single principle of necessitous physical action. Further elucidation from this point of view will be found on subsequent pages under the heading—Natural Morality.

CAUSE AND EFFECT

Nature's inexorable processes reveal the potentialities of cause and effect. They are devoid of chance or caprice. Every effect is just equal to the cause producing it. Nature deals in no compromises. It supports no court of appeal. It is man's province, limitationally, to avail himself of knowledge respecting natural causes and effects, to cognize the natural relationships which affect him, to discern causal and effectual influences and exert himself, adaptatively. Nature, per se, has no concern for man, but man **must be concerned** about Nature, because such concern, involving causes and effects, is absolutely essential to his existence. Nature entertains no excuses for man's ignorance of natural processes; no consideration for man-made gods. It is man's task to become informed respecting natural causes and effects or suffer the consequences of his ignorance. He may, in a sense, attune himself to the rythmic movements of the earth and of the universe; that is his affair. The earth and the universe take no note of him.

* * * *

Those who associate chance, caprice, or design with the processes of Nature must hypothetically divest such processes of the mathematical precision of the movements of matter, thus hypothetically **contradicting** all that is **known and verified,** respecting the modes of

such movements. The contradiction implies eternal confusion and disorder; an eternality of incoherency, a medley of disharmonies. Unthinkable! The term chance—eliminative of cause and effect—is conveniently applied where observations concerning the phenomena of Nature are either much circumscribed, or defective. There can be no effect in the absence of an adequate preceding cause. Whatever prodigality, wastefulness, or apparent disorder, may be attributed to Nature's operations, Nature is ever precise and orderly in its movements from cause to effect. Whatever appears chaotic is nevertheless due to the definite movements of matter. Organic life depends not upon chance, but upon definite physical conditions favorable to living organisms. These conditions represent a chain of successive causes and effects. The destruction of organic life likewise depends upon physical conditions, but different from those pertaining to living organisms. Cause and effect relate to all conditions of matter, inorganic and organic. When the particles of several elementary forms of matter unite they causatively effectuate a form of matter different from either of the elementary units entering into a chemical combination. The vibratory movements of the cellular units (in complex interdependent relationship) of brain matter causatively effectuate the various functionings of brain matter.

Cause and effect are the phenomenal expressions of the moving matter of the universe—of suns and planets, satellites; of the moving matter of every plant and animal; of the moving matter of every human brain.

EVOLUTION

Evolution denotes successive change from simple to complex; from complex to simple.

It is a very far cry from nebulous matter in spiral movement to a solar system. Many millions of years in the reckoning!

Again, it is a very far cry from a molten planet to a planet fitted for matter in its movements to evolve the very lowest forms of organic life. Many more millions of years in the reckoning!

And, again, it is a very far cry from the origin of the simplest form of earthly organic life to Nature's partially finished product—Man!

In estimating the vast period of time intervening between the origin of the simplest organisms and the advent (by gradual evolution) of the man-animal, the figures of geologists vary from 50,000,000 to 100,000,000 years.

Time, in its amplitude, is always with Nature.

Evolution (change) is the order of the universe. Evolution is co-eternal with matter. Evolution is Nature's method of marshalling primary units and variously combining them into all forms of inorganic and organic matter.

Again, let it be repeated, evolution is co-eternal with matter.

Particles of matter, with their mutual attractions,

change—must change—their relative positions in time and space. That is primary evolution.

Inorganic elements combine and by their vibratory activities cause interactions—interactions effectualizing more and more complex combinations of matter. That's evolution—evolution more and more complex.

The same elements unite their potentialties in an environment suited for such union and form protoplasm —the very basis of all organic life. That is evolution still more complex in **changes** wrought.

Since evolution means **change,** both simplicity and complexity are necessary sequences. By progressive evolution (synthetic or constructive) Nature proceeds from the simple to the complex. Retrogressive evolution (analytical or destructive) is Nature's mode of resolving complexity into simplicity.

How marvelously and profoundly impressive, the evolution of simple cells, nucleated cells, and multicellular oragnisms of great complexity of structure—all from primary protoplasmic units!

The basic facts of evolution have passed the point of disputation on the part of all unbiased investigators of natural processes. As time goes on further investigations respecting the complexities and intricacies of such processes will undoubtedly reveal to mankind even more of the marvelous than has ever yet been dreamed of. When mortals, in large numbers, cease to hug delusions resting upon human assumptions, relating to supernaturalism, more attention will be devoted to the book of Nature, with a corresponding advance in scientific investigation and rational enlightenment. Whatever the assumptions of mere credulity, and notwithstanding all the self-importance the man-animal may associate with his ego, there is not a scintilla of evidence in existence in support of the postulate that man will, in all the millions of years of earth life

to come, get **beyond**, or escape **subjection** to natural processes; beyond the reach of natural **causes** and **effects**—beyond the earth! The ultimate particles now complexly collocated in his anatomical structure will doubtlessly be bounding about in space billions of years hence and necessitously participate in the evolution of a solar system, a planet, or a satellite, or again participate, as primary units, in the evolution of complex organizations of matter; but man of the present earth is altogether and absolutely of the earth, earthly; and, verily, how very transitory, how relatively insignificant is man!

With much accuracy of thought and clearness of expression, Dr Henry Smith Williams in his "History of Science" observes: "Every scientist with a wide grasp of facts, who can think clearly and without prejudice over the field of what is known as cosmic evolution, must be driven to believe that the alleged wide gap between vital and non-vital matter, is largely a pigment of prejudiced human understanding. In the broader view there seem to be no gaps in the scheme of cosmic evolution—no break in the incessant reciprocity of atomic actions, whether these atoms be floating as a fire-mist out in one part of space, or aggregated into the brain of man in the other part."

Present diverging views respecting vital and non-vital matter will in the course of years no longer exist even in the minds of laymen in the realm of scientific contemplation. No influence can stay the onward march of accumulating facts and truths revealed by the processes of Nature and the multifarious phenomena resulting therefrom, except a relapse to human barbarism through the instrumentalities of ignorance and credulity utilized by designing men—a possibility now, happily, more remote than in former times. The momentum of verified knowledge inreases

in proportion to its scope and efficiency of dissemination. Anathemas, hurled against evolution from those who have very scant or no information respecting the subject that disturbs their equanimity, or which seemingly threatens to interpose danger to the fixedness of their worldly interests, are becoming less in number because the varied influences of mere traditional superstitions and myths are gradually withering in the light of human knowledge and reason.

THE UNIVERSE

Beyond the confines of our solar system are vast depths of space inhabited by unnumbered suns, planets, satellites, and by nebulous matter. Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler established the limitations of the solar system, and later astronomers (foremost among them the noted Herschel) with their great telescopic reflectors, discovered that the far distant stars—regarded as "points of light" by the ancients—are suns, each and every one of all the millions, and many of them larger than the sun of our relatively small system. And, they are moving suns. Not fixed in space as was for a long time believed. They are whirling in gigantic orbits about some common centre. Our sun is far from that centre. The central luminous mass of our solar system is a star, circling with its rotational attendants, and no different from a myriad of other stars, though not even as large as some. Beyond the few thousand stars visible to the naked eye the astronomers see series after series of more distant suns "marshalled in galaxies of millions." At last a point beyond is reached where the galaxies no longer increase, and yet the limits of astronomical vision have not been attained. Within limitational boundaries beyond our solar system trained astronomers, with their powerful reflectors, outline the universe and "prove that it has the shape of an irregular globe, oblately flattened to almost disklike proportions and divided at an edge, a bifur-

cation that is revealed even to the naked eye in the Milky Way."

This universe, as Herschel conceived it, is a vast galaxy of suns, held to a common centre, poised in space. But, the great telescopes do not pause. Far out beyond this universe are revealed other universes, each composed, as astronomers think, of myriads of suns, each clustered like our galaxy into "islands of matter in an infinite ocean of space." So far distant from our universe are these universes that their light reaches us only as a dim, nebulous glow, mostly invisible to the naked eye. When Herschel began his studies about a hundred of these nebulæ were known. Before the close of the eighteenth century he had discovered about two thousand more of them, and many of these had been resolved by his largest telescopes into clusters of stars. He believed that the farthest of these nebulæ that he could see was at least three hundred thousand times as distant from the earth as the nearest fixed star, yet the nearest fixed star—recent astronomical studies prove—is so remote that light, traveling one hundred and eighty thousand miles a second, requires three and one-half years to reach the vision of the inhabitants of our planet.

These astounding and awe-inspiring findings of Herschel, and later masters of astronomy, at once forcefully suggest the insignificance and impotency of the childish assumptions of credulous and egoistic mortals who predicate anthropomorphic (human-like) supervision of "celestial mechanics."

"Doubtless, the most interesting things revealed by the modern observations of the stars," says Dr. Henry Smith Williams, "relate to the movements of those supposedly 'fixed' bodies. The seeming fixity of the stars is merely due to their distance. In point of fact they are flying through space, singly, in pairs,

in groups, clusters, and in swarms, or in vast streams of incomprehensive magnitude. Some of them move at a rate of more than 150 miles per second; and the average speed of the very large number hitherto tested, according to Prof. W. W. Campbell of Lick Observatory, is 20.2 miles per second. One particular star, the sun, with his attendant planets, moves through space at the rate of about twelve and one-half miles per second, making therefore in point of speed, as in the matter of size, a rather poor showing; yet after all shifting our position in space about 367,000,000 miles each year."

In contemplating the far reaches of our universe and of the still vaster spacial depths of the universes beyond, and the existence of innumerable suns and planets, the conclusion is irresistable that our little earth is not the only planet in infinite space upon which flourishes organic life. Doubtless, planets of numerous solar systems in the boundlessness of space are inhabited by vegetable and animal organisms resembling those of the earth during past and present geological ages. In all probability, wherever physical conditions are favorable organic life is developed. It is the opinion of astronomers that Mars, one of the members of our solar system and 10,000,000 miles distant from the earth, now sustains vegetable and animal life. The planets Jupiter and Saturn, other and more distant neighbors of the earth, are passing through stages of planet life similar to those which our earth passed through before it became fitted for organic life, and there is reason therefore to believe that hundreds of millions of years hence varied forms of animal life will flourish on those planets provided, meanwhile, the heat radiated from the sun is not largely diminished.

THE SOLAR SYSTEM

"Out of darkness into darkness again such are the bourns of cosmic action."—LOWELL.

Many, many millions of years ago the matter now comprising the masses or bodies of the solar system with the sun as its centre, around which the earth and other planets move in their respective orbits, existed in a nebulous, homogeneous form—as cosmical "fire-mist," the vibrating particles of which, in more or less condensed groups and aggregations, contributed to the spiral or vortex movements of such groups and masses. This nebulous matter in its radius far exceeded the present confines of the solar system.

THE NEBULAR HYPOTHESIS OF LAPLACE

The nebular hypothesis of the great French astronomer Laplace, of the eighteenth century, postulates that a widely diffused mass of cosmic matter, which now constitutes the solar system, aggregated about a common centre of attraction and formed a superheated gaseous globe, revolving upon its axis. As the vaporous mass contracted through loss of heat its revolutions became more rapid and from time to time "through balance of forces at its periphery," rings of its substance were whirled off and left revolving there, subsequently to become condensed into planets, and in their turn whirl off minor rings that became moons. The central part of the original mass remains as the

still contracting and rotating sun. The subsequent and relative positions of rings whirled off from the original mass were determined by the continued mutual attractions of all the rapidly rotating bodies of the system in their orbital movements about the sun.

THE PLANETESIMAL HYPOTHESIS

A later theory as to the origin of the solar system, known as the planetesimal hypothesis, came into existence through the astronomical observations of Professor Keeler, formerly director of the Lick Observatory, during the last two years (1898-1900) of his life; and, further developed by Professor T. C. Chamberlain of the University of Chicago and his younger colleague Professor T. R. Moulton. This new theory assumes that the typical spiral nebula is in fact the parent structure of a solar system; that our solar system was once a spiral nebula differing only in size from one of the hundreds of thousands of such bodies that inhabit the universe. In reviewing the planetesimal hypothesis Dr. Williams, in his "History of Science," observes:

"A spiral nebula is a system of worlds in the making. The central nucleus is the future sun. Various of the spots that lie along the arms of the spiral are the nuclei of future planets. Professor Chamberlain calls nuclei of all sizes 'planetesimals' because they are supposed to be revolving in independent orbits like miniature planets. It is obvious at a glance that the larger nuclei—bigger fragments of world stuff—make up the structure of the spiral arms. It should be explained that matter is not streaming along these arms as might be supposed, but that the entire structure is revolving as if it were a solid body. The larger nuclei, however, necessarily exert a gravitational influence over the smaller planetesimals in their neighborhood; hence an incessant shower of smaller particles will fall against

each larger nucleus and this augments its size and its gravitational power. As time goes on, each of these growing nuclei will (through gravitation) suck in the matter from the space about it, as a vacuum cleaner sucks in dust, until each larger body will be revolving in a clear space. Thus the myriads of planetesimals will have been aggregated into a smaller number of planets; and the spiral nebulæ will have been developed into a planetary system. The original central nucleus of the nebulæ having drawn to itself the cloud of minor planetesimals in its neighborhood, becomes a central sun. According to this theory, then, our earth in common with its sister planets, was never a gaseous ring, nor yet a liquid globe, but was built up about a more or less solid nucleus by a perpetual meteoric bombardment. Larger planets of our system may have gathered matter so rapidly, thanks to their greater gravitational power, as to superheat their substances to the stage of liquidity or gaseousness. Such is still the condition of Jupiter and Saturn, and probably also of Uranus and Neptune. But our earth and the other smaller planets were probably from the beginning solid in structure, though doubtless developing a higher inner temperature, through impact and compression. Their growth would be decreasingly rapid as the outlying planetesimal matter within their sphere was more nearly exhausted. But their growth continues, in a minor degree, even now; for it is well known that the earth sweeps up something like a hundred million meteors each day—these meteors being, supposedly, belated fragments of the original spiral nebulæ. Occasionally a larger fragment of world-stuff in the form of a giant meteorite falls into our atmosphere, and finds at last a resting place on earth."

The two theories, thus outlined, as to the origin of the solar system, though divergent in character, never-

theless give absolute support to the conclusion, entertained by all modern astronomers, that the matter constituting our present solar system once existed as diffused nebulous, or attenuated, matter.

It is in place to make brief reference to the Ptolemaic and Copernican theories respecting the movements of the sun and planets of the solar system.

It was the Ptolemaic theory that the earth is the established centre of the solar system about which the stars and planets revolve every twenty-four hours, the sphericity of the earth being admitted.

The Copernican theory, now universally accepted, is that the sun is the centre of the solar system, that the planets including the earth, of course, revolve about it in describing their orbits in space during relatively fixed periods of time. The planets known at the time when the Copernican theory was promulgated were Venus, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn.

The following, excerpted from the writings of Dr. Lowell, the famous astronomer, well illustrates the opposition of ultra conservative thinking to scientific progress: "The Ptolemaic system of the universe was once taught side by side with the Copernican at Harvard and Yale. We are impressed not so much by the age of the universities, as with the youth of modern astronomy, and with the extraordinary vitality of old ideas. That the Ptolemaic system was antiquated at the start, the older Greeks having had juster conceptions, does not lessen our wonder at its tenacity. But the fact helps us to understand why so much fossil error holds its ground in many astronomical text-books to-day. That stale intellectual bread is deemed better for the digestion of the young is one reason why it often seems to them so dry."

Probably as much can safely be remarked of numerous text books—other than astronomical—at present in use.

THE EARTH

The earth came into existence as a part of the solar system—as a minor part of the **work of Nature.** It was **not** catapulted into existence by supernatural decree or fiat. In this twentieth century, with enlightening advantages accruing from accumulations of demonstrable and organized knowledge derived from many fields of scientific research and analysis, **persistence** in clinging to ancient **myths and traditions,** respecting the origin of the earth and all animal life, clearly indicates the **tenacity** of human credulity, and the **insistence of influential** factors contributing to the propagation of the childish fables that abide amid the accumulated mass of many centuries. The outstanding credulities of earlier mankind that continue to widely serve as **barriers** to the permanent progress of the human race, **evidence the fact** that some of the agencies **(assumptively** and with dogged determination) proclaimed to be most civilizing and uplifting are without foundation **in fact** and therefore, **in effect,** deceptive, misleading, unreliable, and in large part retrogressive.

* * * *

In treating of the earth only a few brief geological notations will be presented, and these for the purpose of encouraging the reader to acquire an abundance of detailed and illuminating knowledge to be found in any standard work on geology, and thereby derive a fund of inspiring information from a very interesting and thought-stimulating branch of science.

The geology of science, which relates to the past and present structure of the earth, requires the largest possible conceptions of time. Though such conceptions are more or less vague they afford the mind a wide outlook upon the processes of Nature and the resulting phenomena, thus affording a reasonably fair understanding and appreciation of the vast and varied transformations due to the simple and complex movements of matter in infinite space and time.

* * * *

It is in accord with geology and astronomy to entertain the conclusion that our day has been increased in length since the earlier geological periods of the earth. Then its revolutions upon its axis were very much more rapid, each revolution requiring only 6¾ hours. Since that far-off time the rapidity of the earth's axial movements has been slowly decreasing and, if the now existing harmony of relations between the members of the solar system is maintained, there will come a time when instead of a single revolution of the earth being made in twenty-four hours, a month will be required for each revolution. It is probable that so inconceivably rapid was the velocity of the movement of the earth, when it first became relatively fixed in position as part of the solar system, that a revolution was made in the brief space of an hour. After the outer crust became solidified the friction of the molten matter within decreased from time to time the speed of our planet's revolution about its centre or axis. The retardations caused by internal friction from within preceded, of course, the vast volume of water that subsequently covered the greater part of the earth's surface, and which previously existed as superheated vapor containing, principally, the elements of hydrogen and oxygen, and carbon dioxide. The friction of ocean tides now constitutes the retardant

brake in the diminishment of the speed of the earth's revolutions. The water, now covering about three-fourths of the surface of our planet, is being gradually absorbed by the earth. Vast quantities of it are coursing down through apertures and crevices, finding lodgment in porous rock formations. Ultimately the earth will become a barren, lifeless planet (somewhat like the moon is now) awaiting collision with other masses and reduction to nebulous matter—in readiness to participate in the formation of a new solar system somewhere in the boundless depths of space.

The enormous period of time that elapsed from the earliest existence of the earth (then in a state of high temperature) to the beginning of its rock formations, is perhaps beyond computation, based upon conclusive evidence. From the time of the solidity of the earth's surface until it approximated exterior conditions fitted for the evolution of the lowest forms of vegetable and animal life, the elapsing period according to Geikie, a noted author of standard text-books on geology, was from 100 to 400 million years—100 million years representing the minimum and 400 million years the maximum depositions. There is reason to assume that the rate of deposition, alluded to by Geikie, depended upon the increasing or decreasing volcanic eruptions caused by the interior heat of the earth and the action of water and air upon the rocks already in formation. As previously noted, during the earlier life of the earth, the volume of water (formerly existing as heated vapor) upon its surface was much greater than it is now. The increasing rapid condensation of the dense vapor caused frequent and torrential precipitations of water and, doubtless, the downpours of rain were more numerous and of greater volume than during any subsequent period of the earth's history. For a long time the surface of the earth did

not receive any radiant light and heat from the sun, because of the density of the atmosphere which surrounded it.

The present thickness of the crust of the earth is now estimated at 100 miles. The enveloping gaseous atmosphere is reckoned to extend into space about 500 miles from the surface of the earth, becoming more and more attenuated as the distance from the crust of the earth increases.

The earth has undergone many great changes in surface contour during its geological periods. Enormous upheavals and subsidences were caused by the pressure of superheated steam following the contact of water with the heated inner crust of the earth. These volcanic upheavals and consequent areas of subsidence during the earlier geological periods became less in power and scope as the crust of the earth thickened. The earthquake shocks in the equatorial belt of the earth are at present examples of what was happening on a potentially stupendous scale in former periods of the earth's existence as revealed by evidences of its topography during remote geological ages.

The present surface contour of the earth, with its towering mountains, and its hills and valleys covered with varying depths of soil, is due to upheavals and subsidences of the earth's crust, and the action of water, ice, atmosphere, and heat. The soil, upon which all vegetable and animal life depend for continued existence is the accumulation of disintegrated or decomposed rock, such decomposition having been caused by the action of water, ice, and the sun-heated atmosphere. These agencies have been, and continue to be, potent factors in effectively changing the topography of the earth. Water wears away rocks. The constant dropping of water upon a rock formation will gradually cause a depression in its surface. The deep

channel cut through solid rock below the falls of Niagara is one of the multifarious illustrations of the power or friction of running water during a long period of time. The agencies noted are gradually lowering the heights of mountains and hills and filling up the valleys or depressions of the face of the earth, except where water at its lowest level and in rapid movement is wearing away the rock with which it comes in contact. The mountains and hills of the present will be some feet less in height from surrounding levels a thousand years from now, with a corresponding increase in soil depositions in the valleys and lowlands. Ultimately, these agencies at work during millions of years to come must reduce our planet to a spheroid of approximate uniformity of surface. The oldest rock formations are the most deeply imbedded in the crust of the earth, and relics of former geologic sea floors reveal traces of land surfaces. Fossiliferous remains of plants and animals have been found in depositions in rock formations at great depths from present surfaces. Among the records of the rocks lie the lava and ashes of volcanoes long extinct.

The earlier geological records of the earth show that plant and animal organisms were very different from the types existing in later geological formations.

The structural formations of the earth's crust as geologically designated are divided into a number of periods or ages, and subdivided into stages to more fully present in detail the successive additions and changes wrought during the long ages of the past. The oldest rock formations are those of the Archæozoic and Laurentian ages, as indicated by granitoid rocks. The next age is the Palæozoic, the age of invertebrates, age of fishes and of amphibians, covering the age of coal formations. The Palæozoic is followed

by the Mesozoic age divided into the Triassic, Jurassic, and Cretaceous periods. The Palæozoic was the age of reptiles. The next ascendant stages are the Tertiary and Quaternary, divided into the Eocene, Oligocene, Miocene, Pliocene, and Glacial periods. The earliest evidences of organic life have been found in the Laurentian age. This evidence includes the existence of bacteria depositing iron, lime, sulphur, etc.; algae and molds depositing lime and carbon; single-celled plants depositing siliceous ooze; protozoa (single-celled animals) depositing lime and silica; and many-celled animals. In succeeding ages next in order are evidence of invertebrate and vertebrate animal life, with man at the apex during the Pliocene period of the Tertiary age, and the Glacial period of the Quaternary (present) geological age.

The gradual development and transformation of myriads of organic forms, beginning with single-celled organisms in the Laurentian age required many millions of years.

The enormous lapses of time since the earth, as a member of the solar system, began to become fitted for the beginning of vegetable organisms, and the enormous periods that have since elapsed, indicate how very old the earth must be and, yet, it can hardly be reckoned as having passed middle-life. Its old and declining age will come, just as old age follows the childhood and adult stages of human animals. The rapidity of the revolutions of the earth is decreasing, largely on account of tidal friction. However slowly and imperceptibly, the earth is slowing up. This means that a time will come when one revolution will require a month instead of twenty-four hours; when day and night will alternate once a month from one part of our planet to the other—when the water now on the surface will have become absorbed by the earth. Mean-

while mankind will mark the highest stages of development attainable under attending physical conditions. There will come a time when the last man will perish, forevermore! Excepting only a possible catastrophe —collision with some other mass—animal life will probably continue to exist on the earth for millions of years to come. Ample time for ushering in more of heaven and less of hell! Every succeeding generation contributes its share of weal and woe. It is the task of the human race to determine, without the help of the hypothetical gods of supernaturalism, what shall be the highest possible achievements of mankind!

LIFE

What is life? This question has seriously engaged enquiring minds as far back in the centuries of the past as knowledge of the historic period extends.

Life, in its simplest and most comprehensive definition, is motion. No motion, no life! The universe is alive!

In an organic sense, the end of the life of an organism does **not** mean a cessation of the movements of the elementary units of matter that composed the organic structure when living. Organic structures are **temporary.** Only ultimate units of matter are eternal.

When the units of elemental matter unite chemically and dynamically and form protoplasm—the basis of all vegetable and animal life—their movements are no longer altogether simple, but are more involved and complex; the elemental character of each unit has not been changed, but the movements of each are complexly related to all the movements of the units composing the protoplasmic mass. This is obviously so because, upon the disintegration of the mass the elemental units become released and, as inorganic units, are free to enter into other combinations. Protoplasm reveals the genesis of organic life. Wherefore the difference between the elements combined in protoplasm and the simple movements of the elements? Different because of the complexity of the combination and move-

ments of the elements, as distinguished from the simple movements of the atoms and molecules constituting elementary substances. Since the movement, yea, the life, of an atom of hydrogen, with or without one or more electrons attached, must be quite simple, and, since the synthesis and analysis of mechanico-chemical action in evolving organic tissue and structure involve the unit of hydrogen in complex combination with other units, the interjection of an extraneous "vital" principle would appear entirely gratuitous, or superfluous. Where is there room for, or evidence of, anything but the multiplication of simple movements, the increasing or decreasing complexity of atomic-molecular structure, and differing phenomena of matter in motion, resulting in various conditions or states of matter, including organic life? The chief contention in support of the "vitalistic" theory of life is: "No life except from preceding life." This position may be accepted, provided "preceding life" is extended to "preceding" movements of inorganic matter. The "vital force" manifested by organic structures is very real as the power, the expression, the evidence of simple and involved movements in complex organic combinations of protoplasm—the mechanico-chemical genesis of life.

Natural phenomena are recognized through the sensory organs of human and other animal anatomies, and the recognition of such phenomena forms the only basis for attaining dependable knowledge. Any theory respecting the phenomena of life not associated with such knowledge is obviously devoid of a rational foundation. Reasoning from a mechanico-chemical basis, no more mystery attaches to the phenomenon of life than to the phenomenon of light, the phenomenon of heat, and so forth. The movements of a living animal as a whole, or the movements of all the interrelated parts of the animal however low or

high in complexity of organic structure, constitute the totality of the life of the animal, at any given instant of its existence. When these movements cease the life phenomenon evidenced by the animal ceases. What then as to the life no longer manifested? In the anatomy of the living animal the processes synthetical (constructive) and analytical (destructive) are engaged. The processes in part involve the essential appropriation of oxygen and the adequate elimination of carbon dioxide. The life of the animal ends when the destructive process within its anatomy predominates and the life that was manifested, when the constructive process was more potent than the destructive, ceases.

It is the burden of those who maintain that life is a "vitalistic" something, which exists independent of organized matter, to at least attempt to indicate at what point in the line of development (from the origin of protoplasm to the organic structure of man) the "vitalistic" entity becomes a part of the human organism.

Since the phenomenon of organic life begins with protoplasm, and since the most complex multicellular organisms are composed of protoplasmic units differentiated in the complexity of organic structures, all verified knowledge, thus far attainable, unqualifiedly supports the affirmation that the phenomenon of life revealed by all animals (man included) is a temporary manifestation of complex combinations and movements of matter, and that this manifestation begins and ends amid the everlasting processes of Nature.

EVOLUTION AND MAN

Man, in complexity of anatomical structure and adaptation to environment, represents the crowning work of Nature on our planet. How the human species and all other forms of animal life, in their multifariousness, came into existence was for many centuries a very perplexing question to investigators of natural processes and phenomena. Theological solutions of the profound problem became popular centuries ago, and they remain so now, even in the most civilized quarters of the earth. But, the impetus given by the publications of Charles Darwin, and subsequently by other naturalists of much genius, during the latter half of the nineteenth century, furnished direct and powerfully effective support to the theory of evolution, which had been more or less vaguely entertained and espoused by previous investigators during preceding centuries. The first quarter of the twentieth century finds the men of science everywhere (and all others who have possessed themselves of sufficient knowledge to form enlightened opinions respecting the subject) a unit in supporting the conclusion, of transcendant import, that all existing forms of organic life, whatsoever, typify the effects of successive changes in structure and function through long periods of time—from primordial beginnings in earlier geological epochs. All these multifarious changes, however involved

in complexity, are signified by the term evolution. The more able and progressive exponents of supernatural agencies are disposed to accept the validity of evolution (because their intelligence will not permit them to do otherwise) but they are unable to divest their minds of a designing creator existing apart from the processes of Nature. It does not seem to appear to them that in assuming the existence of a creator extraneous to Nature they invite the assumption of pre-existing creators. Since all that is **known** of natural processes unmistakably indicates that all creative efficiency **inheres** in Nature, assumptions respecting extraneous agencies may be attractive, but they are none the less to be regarded as gratuitous and superfluous. Happily, these progressive metaphysicians are at least partly on the side of those who discern the vital importance of **rational knowledge** as an essential factor in advancing helpful human enlightenment. But this observation is intended only to apply to those makers of theological dicta who are not striving to keep their believing **followers** in **ignorance** of the facts of evolution and of the true logic of such facts. It often happens that half-way adherents of an established truth in Nature are among the worst enemies of truth. Some of the "orthodox" theologians may, perhaps do, in a general way, secretly entertain an attitude favorable to evolution, without permitting the subject to inharmoniously affect their theological tenets. It is to be noted to their credit that they do not hypocritically discuss and openly denounce what they themselves partly believe. They are trying to be as consistent as they can be, under the stress of environmental and other influences—and that is to their credit also. While these considerations are in a measure encouraging, it is reasonably certain that a majority of pulpiteers refuse to accept the evidences of evolution,

and among the majority, here and there, are those who now and then insist upon making public exhibitions of their crass ignorance and intellectual stupidity by condemning evolution as being without foundation in fact, especially as it concerns man. These are the bigoted ultra-conservatives in the realm of theological mysteries, and they are entitled to charitable reflections in the same sense as are the general frailties and shortcomings of ignorance and credulity. The great masses of humanity doubtlessly are, as yet, either totally or in large part uninformed (through no fault of theirs) regarding evolution. They are not so informed because of the deficiency, or the inefficiency, of their educational training. It is obviously absurd to expect any member of the human species to know that which cannot be known to that member, because of limitations precluding accessible sources of information. While, in a general sense, the destructiveness and banefulness of ignorance are to be deplored, or even condemned, the ignorance of the individual units of society, respecting questions of very great importance as affecting the welfare of humanity, is entirely another matter. To condemn those who are doing about the best they can do, and thinking about as much as they are able to think, amid the conditions under which they have lived and are living, is manifestly unjust.

A few of the very numerous and well established facts of evolution, pertaining particularly to man, will now be presented:

The principal inorganic elements constituting the human anatomy are hydrogen, oxygen, carbon, nitrogen, phosphorous, sulphur, iron, chlorine, and silicon. All these and all other elemental forms of matter, in chemical and dynamical combinations of great complexity, found in the multicellular structure of man,

are very common earthly matter or substance. The gradual development of the human organism with its millions of cells, relatively fixed in type and propagating its species, required a very long period of time. The successively propagated generations of all the various species of animals involve relatively brief periods for each generation.

The genesis and organic development of the individual member of the human species, are linked with the genesis and development of the species as a whole. It has been biologically determined that man of the present in the **embryonic stage of his development and growth exhibits the progressively complex changes and modifications, relating to form and function, which have characterized the development and life history of the species.** In other words, and more briefly, the embryonic development of the individual is an epitome of the evolutionary development of the species, beginning with single cells of protoplasmic structure. These primary cells also formed the life beginnings of all forms of organisms that later came to be grouped in the various so-called species or groups of animal existence—the development of the varying species having been effectualized by the multifarious differences and differentiations in the multicellular organic structures. The evolution of single cells from simple protoplasm marked the beginning of vegetable and animal organisms—attracting and subsisting upon protoplasm and inorganic substances. It has been found impossible to distinguish any difference between some of the most primary vegetable and animal organisms.

Many, many millions of years intervened between the existence of primary protozoons (single cell organisms of the Laurentian geological age) and the advent of man, but the organisms in lines antecedent to the genesis of the human organism, with all its present

complexity, hark back to a remote period of geologic time. While the successive evolutionary advances were in course the lower organic types became relatively stable for a time, but then advanced again and again, thus involving more and more complexity of structure and becoming invested with the potentialities of heredity. These potentialities in the evolution of the various species brought about the transmission of characteristics of form and function common to each species during the different stages of development. The influences of heredity, while becoming more or less constant in character were nevertheless, during long periods modified or changed, in part at least. The potencies of heredity were, and continue to be, the chief contributing causes in determining and maintaining the relatively fixed types of the different species of vegetable and animal organisms. However, these types were and are yet constantly affected by influences which cause modifications and changes in the distinguishing characteristics of organic forms. Heredity, through the transmission of influences resulting in more or less permanence of the types or species, from generation to generation, solved many of the former mysteries associated with the higher and more complex evolution of organic life. Environment (influences from without) and heredity (influences from within) shaped the structure and individual character and functions of all the more complex organisms. Without the hereditary transmission of certain determining potentialities, beginning with organisms relatively simple in structure, and the transmission of such potentialities to all the progressively complex organisms, organic life as evolved and now witnessed on our planet would have been impossible. Instantaneous creations are not a part of Nature's processes.

The development of organic life, over wide areas

of the earth's surface was manifestly not continuous; breaks in life lines were inevitable on account of vast upheavals and subsidences resulting in extensive transformations in rock structures and causing death to myriads of living organisms. Many organisms were either shifted from one quarter to another, or destroyed during two great glacial periods —the probable causes of which cannot be referred to here. These periods, intervening between the tertiary and quaternary ages embrace at least 100,000 years. The changes that took place in living organisms during this time included those affecting man—who had then already advanced to about his present stage of physical development.

The human species belongs to the mammalia (all animals that nourish their young with milk) and it has been shown that the mammalia originated from a single ancestral form which lived in the Triassic geological period, though having ascended from still lower forms—amphibia and reptilia. The outstanding and very significant fact is that the anthropogeny and anatomy of science afford ample evidence to show that the primates—of the Triassic period—lemurs, monkeys, anthropoid apes, and man—**descended from one common stem.** Moreover, the existing differences in structure between man and ape are not so marked as to afford, by any means, sufficient grounds for man to repudiate relationship to a previously existing animal **very similar** to the higher apes.

The successive stages of development of the human embryo reveal the most astonishing and suggestive findings of the biology of science. These findings reinforce the facts derived from paleontology, which firmly establish the evidence of the evolution of man from very remote ancestral types. Biology shows the essential similarity of the original egg cells of man

and other animals. When the sperm of the male attaches to, or unites with, the germ or ovum of the female (both sperm and germ being invested with hereditary and other potential tendencies) the embryonic life of the individual human embryo begins, receiving in course of development the food sustenance required in its growth from the blood of the female parent. At certain stages of development the human embryo cannot be distinguished from the embryos, at given periods, of a number of animals much lower in the scale of organic existence than man. If geology and paleontology even failed in part (which they do not) to prove the evolution of the human species from very primary organisms, biology would more than make up the deficiency in evidence.

The evolution of language from primitive sounds was doubtless contemporaneous with the development of brain functions, and the divergent character of language thus acquired was due to the more or less widely (geographically) separated segregations or tribal groupings of the human species. There are now speechless tribes which exhibit a language faculty only in embryo and not much raised above that of lower animals. The speechlessness of more primitive man, in the early childhood of the race, may well be compared to the inability of human babes to speak the language of their parents. The infants are without words, and the sounds they utter give promise of a later development of speech. As in embryo, so at later stages of its existence, the developing child epitomizes the stages of the evolutionary processes involved in the development of the race. This applies, of course, to language as well as to the gradual increase and enlargement of the convolutions (foldings of cellular matter) of the brain. The lower the stage in the scale of animal descent the smaller the number of brain convo-

lutions. The lower orders of mammalia show but slight traces of such development. Bees and ants, though relatively small in form, exhibit a higher degree of organization, and their brains present convolutions much out of proportion to their anatomies as a whole. This accounts for the remarkable instinct, or primary intelligence, so frequently manifested by the industrious makers of honey and by the equally active, though destructive, ants. The differences in convolutions of brain matter noted among the lower animals apply to individual human brains. These differences become very marked in comparing the intellectual weaklings of the race with those of strong intellectual equipment. Differences in degree, not in kind, are written large amid the manifestations of the weakness and the strength of mankind, and very forcibly illustrate the effects of purely evolutionary processes which involve, as they do, great variations in individuals of the same species; variations caused, most potently, by the influences of heredity and environment.

* * * *

The evolution of man involved his struggle for existence against influences destructive in character, within and without his anatomy. It is a hard fact that all animal life is the resultant of opposing influences due to the constructive and destructive activities of organic matter. Hence a constant struggle. No struggle, no organic life; no evolutionary development. Therefore, struggle is the natural, necessitous penalty of human existence. The "survival of the fittest" amid the struggle clearly implies that the organisms best fitted to withstand destructive influences, and progressively develop, survived, while other organisms not so fitted perished prior to the completion of full development, or, before reaching the limits of longevity common to

members of the species. The struggle for existence among civilized mankind very frequently eventuates in the loss to humanity of individuals (early in life or in middle age) of intellectual and moral qualities and attainments, because of physical weaknesses and the inability to resist unfavorable hereditary potencies, or the ravages of disease, while vast numbers of those morally and intellectually **unfitted** to figure on the constructive side of human existence, are physically so vigorous as to resist the influences which destroy life. It is quite obvious, therefore, that the operations of Nature, proceeding from cause to effect, are totally devoid of any concern respecting the fitness or the unfitness of members of any species of animals, as from human viewpoints they may appear to be.

* * * *

The man-animal at any given time during the short span of individual life represents the resultants of the activities of anatomical structure, plus the influences of environment. He is no more nor less than the sum-total of all the determining factors involved in his existence as a sojourner on the face of the earth, of which he is in **totality** the evolutionary product. Whatever of pride or vain conjecture he may associate with himself, every image of his brain, every phantasmagorical vision he may nurture in his conscious moments, every fact and assumption he may cherish with a sense of superiority and self-satisfaction, are but the transitory expressions of efficient and purely physical causations which arise within his anatomical structure and which are involved in his evolutionary existence. Neither mere assertion, nor assumption, can establish the facts of evolution, because the evidences in support thereof exist independently of human ipsi dixits. The great task is to discern the facts. Truths are discovered and stated by man. They are neither God-

made, nor man-made. Whatever of eternal truth exists is established by facts derived from pre-existing evidence. It is quite natural for those who are not informed with respect to the evolutionary development of man from primitive organisms to be shocked when told that the animal species to which they are bound hard and fast, is remotely related to lizards, or a type similar to lizards, and that among their ancestors of a far-off geological age were reptiles and fishes. Nevertheless, biological, if not paleontological, findings support the statement. Those who have been trained to believe that man was ushered full-fledged, fully-developed, into mundane existence by the fiat of a man-made God, are easily disconcerted when their sense of vanity is disturbed. Once the facts of evolution become plain to men their strong inclination will be to accept such facts, and no longer experience feelings of repugnance in contemplating ancestral relationship to lemurs, monkeys, or gorillas. Rather will they regard with philosophic complacency the similarity of their ancestors to simian types, and see that existing evidence shows that even monkeys could not be guilty of the fiendish crimes committed by men in the first quarter of the twentieth century. The cultivated greed and ambition of modern man, united with the influences of crass credulity have caused a portion of the human race to largely increase, rather than decrease, the sum-total of heartless wickedness. Many of the resulting, misery-breeding crimes, including the monstrous crimes of war, of the present and previous centuries, lower the human species in any comparison which can be made with any other species of animals in existence. Therefore, it illy becomes vainglorious man, to disdainfully disregard his distant ancestors.

The wide dissemination and efficient inculcation

of the **facts** of evolution will enable man to draw many lines of similarity existing between his anatomy and the anatomies of other animals. They will encourage him to significantly note **the fact that more difference in structure and capacity now exists between the most highly developed and the lowest developed man than between the latter and the highest developed anthropoid ape.** Furthermore, this important fact will incline man—disposed to boast of his exalted state of civilization—to anticipate that future centuries will find men surprised and shocked as they read in historical records of man's cruel, heartless, and demoniacal inhumanity to man in the twentieth century—when all manner of assumptions, credulities, and supernatural religions flourished galore; when schools, colleges, universities, and other educational instrumentalities were **numerously in evidence.** What a mixture of boasted civilization and of something worse than barbarism (all in the twentieth century) will be presented to the inhabitants of the earth a thousand, or five thousand, years from now! The obligation clearly rests upon mankind of the present to insist upon the accumulation of more and more information as to man's true place in Nature, to know more and more of his evolutionary genesis and development, and more and more how to best apply knowledge thus derived for the efficient enlightenment, intellectually and morally, and the **permanent betterment** of the present and succeeding generations of mankind.

In conclusion, some reference to the question "How old is man?" is in place: The question involves much that is not known. If it could be determined about when man-animals first began to roam about on the earth on two legs instead of four, and to use clubs and stones in their struggle for existence—thus gaining advantages of much importance to them—it

might then be roughly stated that a million years have elapsed since the man-animal became a pronounced type of the genus homo species. Men of science, were they disposed to adopt positive procedures in establishing exact periods when evolutionary processes reached certain definite points in organic development, much like the proceedings of the early church fathers when they conjecturally fixed upon the year and hour of the allegorical creation from nothing of man and all living things, could easily, albeit imaginatively, answer the question. According to Prof. O. E. Marsh, a famous American paleontologist, it is not an exaggeration to estimate that 250,000 years ago the man-animal was fully developed physically in most essential particulars, and that he then possessed all the brain functions of man of the present age. Obviously, some of the functions of his brain were not developed to the same extent as those of the most highly developed members of the human race of the twentieth century. The same author's opinion was that, according to Professor Whitney's famous discoveries in the American pliocene period of human remains and utensils fashioned by human hands, the tertiary man must have existed prior to the time stated. The antiquity of the Piltdown man of Sussex, England, is established at from 100,000 to 300,000 years. The restored skull by J. H. McGregor, as well illustrated in Osborne's "Men of the Old Stone Age," exhibits an ape-like structure of the jaws, and also an expression of considerable intelligence in the face. The **Pithecanthropus erectus,** the ape-man of Java, is conservatively estimated to have thrived 500,000 years ago. Osborne says "it is not improbable that the pre-human races of this geological age used more than one natural weapon of wood and stone." The great antiquity of man, in erect posture, is beyond disputation.

His advancement through the acquirement and utilization of various weapons and contrivances to assist him in self-protection and in obtaining subsistence became more rapid in the course of time and resulted during many subsequent centuries in finally establishing him at the very apex of all organic life. Civilization of the present century is yet afar off from possible heights of development, intellectually and morally, respecting the human race as a whole. Just how much evolutionary progress will be made ere disintegrating and retrogressive processes will intervene raises a question in the absence of available information upon which to base an answer. It is certain, however, progressive evolutionary (altogether natural) processes, as they pertain to planetary conditions favorable to the development of organic life, are by no means wholly indicative of permanence or perpetuity. It is probable that civilization, like ocean tides, will continue to rise and fall; that advances and higher achievements will be succeeded by recessions from relatively high standards, due to **internal weaknesses of the social fabric.** The principles involved both in constructive and destructive processes throughout the universe **invariably apply to all forms of civilization,** whatsoever. These principles have applied, in all particulars, to the **evolution of man** from simple protoplasm; they will continue to apply to **all** the organic activities of the human race, individually and collectively, until the very last representative of the species genus homo perishes from the earth. The evolution of man is only a part of the life-history of our planet. The earth, having had a beginning, will reach its end. Somewhere between the beginning and the end mankind transiently figures as one of the evolutionary products of the earth. Ultimately, the life of our race will be "as a tale that is told."

MATTER AND MIND

From matter we rise to mind by means of brain matter.
—H. TUTTLE.

The highest and most complex portion of the human anatomy is the brain, composed of myriads of cells of rapidly vibrating nerve matter, variously grouped and convoluted, and capable of discharging a number of different functions. The varying differences in character of the cell-groups are determined by differentiations in cellular structure and movement, each group being adapted to a particular brain function. The correlations sustained between the intimately associated portions of the brain are mutually influential. The brain is directly and indirectly united, vitally and efficiently, with the whole nerve structure of the human anatomy. The various co-ordinating relations existing between the brain and all the nerves of the body are defined in modern text-books relating to the anatomy, physiology, and the physical psychology of science.

The general term mind as here employed is intended to include awareness, consciousness, cognition, and all the higher manifestations of cerebral activity. Every phase whatsoever of mind is the **expression** or phenomenal accompaniment of a **state** of brain matter. These states vary in their expressions in propor-

tion to the differences in character and activity of the cells involved in mind phenomena. In the absence of states of brain matter there has never yet been produced a particle of evidence of mind in any of its phases. In the absence of consciousness, which implies the wakeful and sustained activity of the brain as a whole, the man-animal is quite unconscious of his own existence and oblivious to all existences about him. Consciousness is renewed only when certain activities of the brain are re-established. Therefore, consciousness can be plainly viewed in no other way than as a temporary phenomenon of the activity of brain matter. All the divisional portions of the brain involved in its various functions must represent definite activities in sustaining the various states which exhibit the different phases of mind. A part of the brain functions vision, or seeing, by reason of impulses from without being impressed upon the nerves of the eyes. Destroy the nerves of the eyes and vision forever ceases where it had previously existed. When impulses from without are prevented from reaching that part of the brain which functions hearing, deafness results. Consider that portion of the brain which functions reasoning, the most complex work of the gray matter contained within the cranium. Serious disturbance or modification of the normal activities of brain matter in that section or compartment leads to a serious interference with, or to the elimination of the process of reasoning. All the strength and all the weakness associated with all the activities and functions of the brain are constantly determined by the varying conditions or states of brain matter, whatever the contributing factors related to those conditions may be. The different parts of the brain being mutually interdependent, as previously stated, the normal or abnormal activities of any part exert favorable or unfavorable in-

fluences upon every other part. The very complex, physico-chemical, and mechanistic character of the structure of the brain as a whole, or of its parts, presents marvelously precise and delicate adjustments, so that untoward influences, arising from within or without the anatomy, impressed upon the gray matter, modify and vitiate the character of the work it is normally qualified to do. Every nerve impulse or sensation arising in any part of the anatomy, however indirectly it may be conducted thereto, becomes involved in the activities of the brain.

While there is no evidence whatsoever of the phenomenal existence of what is termed mind, separate and apart from the activities of brain matter, it by no means follows that man has anything compared to a complete monopoly of mind. Whatever of great importance is attached to the highest product of Nature on our planet, man has much in common—anatomically, physiologically and even psychologically—with all other species of animals and the higher insectivora. It can hardly be successfully disputed that bees and ants, in proportion to their volume of brain matter, as compared with the vastly greater volume in the dome of the human anatomy, are equally as clever, intuitively, and as intelligent, in a sense, as man. Their adaptation of means to precise ends, within the scope of their ability, and the mathematical accuracy of some of their work cannot be excelled by man. All of the higher animals next to man also give evidence of discriminative brain work. Many of them reason, at least in a primitive sense, and rather effectively, too. The master's dog learns to know, by experience, by putting this and that together, the different moods of his master—the differences between intonations expressive of kindness, and sounds expressive of harshness, and so forth. What is true of dogs is likewise

true of horses, and the more the activities of animals lower than man are closely observed and considered, the more evidence is discerned respecting the work of their brains. The most primitive brains of men, as represented by some of the lower types of mankind do not possess, as a whole, as much intelligence as the higher types among other species of animals.

Those who may insist upon the existence of mind as a something, or as an entity, separate and apart from brain and nerve matter, place upon themselves the burden of showing, first, the whereabouts of the mind of man when he is in profound slumber; second, why the assumed entity is so lavishly bestowed upon some individuals and so parsimoniously allotted to others; and third, what becomes of the mind of a man, or of the mind of any other animal, when both man and animal cease to exist. Practically, the same burden rests upon those who postulate the existence of "ideas" extraneous to the physical phenomena of brain matter, or those who go so far with their idealizations as to feel encouraged to regard ideas as being the only real existences. In so far as verified knowledge of brain activities, and their resulting phenomena, extends at present, there can be found no valid argument in opposition to the conclusion that **all phases of mind** (hallucinations and delusions included) reveal **definite states** of brain matter, and that in the absence of the activity of brain matter there is no evidence either of the existence, or of the manifestation of mind.

NATURAL MORALITY

Fundamentally and broadly considered, Nature is unmoral—neither moral nor immoral; neither good nor evil; neither kind nor cruel; neither merciful nor unmerciful; neither just nor unjust; yet precise in all its processes.

Electrical discharges from cloudland descend and destroy life. Electricity takes no account of its deadly work. Those who happen to get in line with the direction of its movements must suffer the consequences, fatal or otherwise, and without escape or redress. Cyclones destroy lives and property. The gyrating matter forming cyclones has no feeling or pity for those who suffer or die on account of its rapid movements. Earthquakes demolish human habitations and cause the death of thousands of mortals. Earthquakes have no murderous intent, no compassion, or pity. The elements all about us unsparingingly contribute to both the existence and the destruction of humanity; but the elements are totally unconcerned as to whether humanity exists or ceases to exist. Light and heat—as light and heat derived from the sun—are devoid of any consciousness respecting the continuity or cessation of human life. Disease fatally affects mankind without feeling or regard for the sufferings and woes in consequence thereof—regardless of the goodness or wickedness, the worth or worthlessness, of its victims; and, regardless of all prayers and petitions. Large num-

bers of the noblest and best of our race, in the prime of life, are from time to time smitten to death by disease, or by man's cruel "inhumanity to man," while great hordes of criminals, derelicts, and worthless parasites, continue to exist as dangers to and burdens upon society. Disease exhibits the relentless operation of **cause** and **effect.** The prevention of fatalities from disease, and from the death-dealing influences of mankind, **through human,** and only **human instrumentalities,** is altogether another matter—as will be indicated hereinafter.

Since Nature in its universal primary processes is neither moral nor immoral, whence come morality and immorality?

The constructive and destructive processes, pertaining to the formation and disintegration of masses and combinations of matter throughout the universe, likewise pertain to the evolution, birth, existence, and dissolution of animal organisms, and to **all** their life activities. The **same processes** comprehend **in their entirety** the influences of human conduct including those designated, relatively, as good and evil.

The multifarious movements of matter involved in the transitions from inorganic to the most complex organic structures conform to numerous lines of differentiating activities—(chemico-mechanical in character); all the succeeding conditions or states of matter in all lines differing **one from another.** Thus, Nature has created through evolutionary processes the highly organized brain of the highest type of the human species of animals. This brain reveals the phenomenon of mind. The elemental units of which the cellular or brain mass is composed, exhibit no mind phenomena, **because** they are **not** chemically and mechanically **combined and organized,** as is the brain. It therefore appears that, operating from the **simple** to

the **complex** in matter-movements Nature in part became **humanized in man!**—in an organism capable of **limitationally interpreting the processes of its creator!** Nature has sufficiently developed man and other animals to enable them to interpret in part various phenomena of Nature, and to be measurably and **advantageously** influenced by such interpretations!

Reverting to the transitions from inorganic matter to the most complex organisms, as noted in the preceding paragraph, a few supplementary considerations are submitted as antecedent to the further discussion of the subject of this essay:

A given mass of inorganic matter common to the earth, and of the earth, earthly, contains **all** the chemically elemental units found in the human anatomy. These units as combined in the formation of protoplasm—the basis of all organic life—are as a whole **no longer** characterized, in their changed relationships, as inorganic matter. Their inorganic character, individually, remains the same, but the character of the combination they have effected is altogether different. Protoplasm—mobile, gelatinous—exhibits no resemblance in appearance or character to the mass of inorganic matter from which it was evolved. The next gradation above protoplasm is a simple cell; next, a nucleated cell of protoplasmic matter. Then follow, in orderly sequence, from simple to complex, the multiplication of nucleated and differentiated cells which enter into the somewhat higher forms of organic life, manifesting sensation, and so forth. Primary sensations precede the final evolution of the nerve and brain structure of the human anatomy. There must have arisen in the brain, in course of its development, various functional characteristics revealing varying states of brain matter. In this way man became **naturally humanized** and **endowed** with cognition, memory, and the

ability to discern differences between two or more objects about him. His primary sensations were thus augmented by more complex and effectualizing conditions or states of nerve and brain matter. Evidently, the origin of self-consciousness was accompanied by the advent of awareness, cognition, memory, and various other states of functionalized brain matter. Primitive man, affected by sundry external influences, as well as by influences within his anatomy, learned to draw lines of difference and distinction (in cause and effect) associated with such influences—especially with influences from without. In a perfectly natural way early man discerned the effect of his acts upon others of his species about him; acts primitively moral and immoral, loving, hateful, and otherwise. His moral acts exerted a goodly influence upon his associates and himself. His immoral or harmful acts resulting inimically to others, similar acts toward him from others followed. The mutual interdependence always existing between individuals of the human species necessitated moral conduct, however circumscribed, on the part of all. Sympathetic and mutually helpful actions on the part of individuals form the very basis, the only basis of enduring human society; beginning with the family unit. No doubt the moral tone of primitive man was crude and devoid of much acuteness. [About as much can be observed of the moral tone of millions of mankind in the twentieth century, since some of the elements of our complex modern civilization tend toward all manner of moral delinquencies]. However, in the course of evolutionary progress, during long periods of time, mankind, in considerable part, reached higher and still higher stages of development until the highest and most efficiently trained man-animals now represent the loftiest standards of morality thus far attainable. To what extent morality has been

increased, during its evolutionary stages, by the element of fear, will always remain a mooted question. But, true it is, that neither fear, nor any form of worship rooted in fear, is a dependable and permanent **criterion** of the natural **moral status** of individuals. Mere emotional goodness usually lasts until the temporary emotional influences abate. Moreover, various forms of immorality are frequently associated with emotional activities—however important the part performed by the emotions when directed by the sense of right and by reason. Elevated moral standards are invariably determined by the influences of heredity and by the intellectual and moral training incident to environmental influences. Morality, theoretical and practical, is a **purely natural**, evolutionary development, involving many, many thousands of years of experience derived from human associations and necessities. The moral concepts of primitive man must have been vague and crude, but crude as they were, they served needful and essential purposes relating to his existence and progress. The perniciously false and childish dogma (foisted upon humanity in the early part of the Christian era) of man's original, inborn, total sinfulness by nature, has ever since inflicted harmful effects upon humanity. Its baneful influence will exist until it is forced into the shades of oblivion, along with a number of other conjectural aberrations that continue to **weaken** and **curse** mankind. There is amid the myriads of organisms on earth none more pure and guileness in its very innocence than a newly born babe. Its hereditary potentialities, for which it is absolutely irresponsible, involve potencies for both good and evil, but the character that will stamp its adult life will meanwhile depend upon its environment; upon its intellectual and moral training. A child well born is easily perverted in an atmosphere of ignorance and im-

morality. A child not so well born is likely to develop into a useful member of society if trained amid moral influences and directed by discriminating intelligence. Whatever of sinfulness there be in the human race, such sinfulness bears no relationship to the dogmas of hallucination. Moreover, it is a momentous and very significant consideration that some so-called civilizing agencies are in their last analysis more productive of immorality than of morality. Instead of "original sin" having been inflicted upon the race, man has developed many forms of immorality, of which his more or less remote ancestors could not have been guilty. Some of the moral derelictions and delinquencies of present-day civilization have been cumulative. They are the effects of causal conditions that have come to inhere in the social fabric through influences arising concomitantly with the character of our civilization, from time to time, however much boasting may be done with respect to its standards. Notwithstanding these discouraging considerations, the moral (constructive) influences of humanity, as a whole, are more potential than the immoral (destructive) potencies of mankind. Under certain conditions men are naturally moral; under certain other conditions men are naturally immoral. Constructive and destructive influences are always and everywhere struggling for supremacy in human acts and affairs. So far as human behavior is concerned civilized society will continue to exist so long as moral influences are more determinative than immoral influences, and no longer. Our civilization as yet is not as far removed from barabrism as human vanity supposes.

Whatever the false claims and pretenses of supernatural ecclesiasticism, natural morality and rational knowledge have been and always will be the bulwark of any form of civilization worthy of the name and

entitled to the admiration and respect of sane men. Natural morality has been evolved in the struggle for existence in a world of natural conditions and is the **natural** product born of the needs and necessities of the human race in course of development through ages of the past. **Enlightened natural morality** is the ultimate and crucial test of the **real value** of all religions. There is no scientific fact at variance with the existence of natural morality and immorality. Natural morality is **humanly constructive.** Natural immorality is humanly destructive. All Nature is **natural.** It is the essentially needful task of mankind to **discern** the natural influences which relatively and vitally affect the human race, as being good and helpful; to discern the natural influences which harmfully and destructively affect the race, and to acquire enough wisdom and strength to **maintain** the **supremacy** of naturally and humanly constructive influences. Failure to do so will mean the destruction of human society.

The obligations arising from the natural relations existing between man and man necessarily establish **man's moral responsibility** to man. This responsibility **begins** and **ends** with man, and imposes very serious duties upon mankind, individually and collectively. Failure to recognize and discharge such duties must inevitably lead to consequences of a destructive and disastrous character. Man is the **only savior** of mankind, morally and in all other respects.

REASON AND MORALS

Evidently the functions of memory, reason, and natural morality, were contemporaneous in origin in the brain of the man-animal. These functions are closely related, each obviously dependent upon the other. The weakness or strength of one affects the other and modifies the causal effects of each. Merely the awareness or cognition of a moral cause or effect without the constructive interposition of memory and reason—respecting relations and conclusions—would be only awareness or cognition. Moral conceptions unsupported by moral acts are divested of their goodly influences.

Reason and morality are the safeguards of individuals and of society, and the more enlightened they become the more will humanly helpful influences and abiding progress be manifested by mankind.

A moral impulse, unguided by reason, may in its effects prove both immoral and unjust. Very conscientious persons have been known to encourage immorality by exercising unreason and injustice. Since knowledge, of whatsoever kind, to be accurately regarded as true, must stand the test of evidential analysis at the bar of reason, it must follow that if moral and immoral actions in their effects are to be correctly classified reason, guided by facts, must perform the task.

Reason deals with relations existing between two or more objects or things. These relations are dis-

cerned, as clearly as may be, by observation and experience. This discernment, when supplemented by careful reasoning, becomes dependable. Man sees, observes, feels; these sensations result in experience, memory. Reason analyzes effects and establishes conclusions by comparison as to various activities of the human organism, including those which have to do with conduct or behavior—moral and immoral; relatively good and relatively bad, or evil. A child sees and hears, but its sensations are in a state of incoherency. By and by discernment and discrimination enable it to distinguish in a primitive and inexpressible way, one sensation from another, even though it must scorch its little fingers a number of times while making progress. The child develops and learns to know a few things. If environment is favorable and the natural mental capacity of the little one is up to the average the process of observing and knowing is accelerated. The intellectual status of the adult is determined by the activities, the opportunities, and the training received during childhood and youth. This status can only be expressed in terms relating to knowledge; and upon knowledge is based the moral status of the individual, plus or minus the potencies of heredity. The knowledge of a man or woman may be quite limited, and yet it may find expression in moral rather than in immoral action. On the other hand knowledge may be rather profuse and find expression in immoral rather than in moral action. It depends upon the **kind** of knowledge; a little of the **right kind** often contributes much toward making better men and women. Moreover, all actions prompted by such knowledge as can be demonstrated by observation, experience, and reason, to be relatively true and rightful, constitute the bed-rock foundation upon which is reared the complex social structure broadly termed so-

ciety. Knowledge, attested by reasoning from cause to effect, is at the very basis of all that is permanent and enduring in laws and government, at the basis of all justice—provided, of course, such knowledge harmonizes, in its application, with the highest standards of moral conduct. To distinguish between rightful and wrongful action the individual must first understand more or less clearly the difference in the results flowing from both kinds of action, as they affect the individual and others within range of the influence of these results. This understanding is shaped, made coherent, and directed by reason. Individuals are prone merely to assume that certain lines of action are morally right and just and then essay to enforce their assumptions without halting to put their notions to the test of reason. No matter how "conscientious" they may feel themselves to be, if their feelings are based upon false premises, upon error, the final effects of their feelings put into action will be baneful. It is not what men believe to be right or what they believe to be true that establishes either right or truth, for in the absence of applied reason by which to demonstrate in the light of **known facts** the correctness of their beliefs they are just as likely to be in the path of error as in the path of truth—as to that which is effectually right or wrong, just or unjust. Every act of morality or immorality is inherently moral or immoral, right or wrong—no matter by whom committed. Right is everywhere and always on the constructive side of human affairs. Wrong is always and everywhere an element of destruction. Moral and other truths, established by reasoning upon verified knowledge, illumine the recesses of error and finally establish unerring finger-boards pointing toward the avenues of right and justice—toward the domain where right, not might—and mere popular acclaim—stands

for the simple and unostentatious rihtfulness of doing right. In this domain all men are free to unite their efforts in helping to make this world a really better world, without wearing cloaks of hypocrisy, without compromising truth by espousing error, without bending a knee to creeds, or being moved by mere emotion.

MATERIALISM

The term materialism is variously defined. It has a wealth of meaning, in a general sense, because it relates to matter, the movements of which give rise to all the phenomena of Nature. The influence of popular vagaries greatly encourages the use of the term to express supercillious derision for materialists—those who do not recognize the existence of so-called spirit as an entity, or as anything separate and apart from the temporary manifestations or phenomena of brain matter. Those who use the term most freely, in a derogatory manner, do not pause to attempt to define it, specifically or otherwise, since specific definitions are likely to interrupt the flow of conjectural verbosity and disturb the equanimity of egotism. A number of current definitions will not be included in this discussion, which is intended to relate principally to those who deride materialism because of their conceptions, however vague, of "spirit." Therefore, the term will be used to express non-agreement with what it asserted of spirit. The latter term is variously defined by the exponents of supernaturalism as "the breath of life," a "life-principle," "soul," a "disembodied soul"—soul and spirit being usually employed synonomously. These definitions enmesh us in a network of ambiguous phrases. If the "spirit" is the "breath of life," and the "breath of life" is the "soul" or "life principle" of man, then spirit, breath, soul, and life principle, ob-

viously cease their manifestations at the close of the life-existence of man, individually or collectively—terminate with the cessation of the breathing process. The breathing of all animal organisms is purely a physico-mechanical operation; when breathing ceases the animal dies. However, theologically conjectured and defined, a "disembodied soul" implies the continued existence of soul apart from bodily (physical) contact, as something apart from something, without being something. Here is where the doctors of divinity and others rest their claim with a degree of positiveness that repels all argumentation. Nevertheless, the burden of proof rests upon the claimants. Pending the presentation of proof, materialists are not required to interpose either affirmation or denial. Their chief concern is associated with the evidence of facts. It is their obligation to go as far as evidence will permit them to go, and not mistake a pure assumption for verified information. However, they rightly abstain from positive denial; they would rather await proof of the existence of a "disembodied soul," and humbly ask to be excused from accepting a mere postulate.

A portion of humanity has been instructed, theologically, to exalt "spirit" and degrade matter as being far beneath "spiritual things." In analyzing this popular attitude of mind several contributing factors are discerned, which include the influence of mere conjecture and a lamentable disregard for what is known of Natural processes. The extent to which this disregard is associated with paucity of reliable information would be difficult to estimate.

If a beautiful and delicately perfumed flower were possessed of mind and speech and would pass under the tutelage of "inspirationists and "spiritists," it might easily be prompted to exclaim: "Tell me not that my perfection of form, my beauty, and the fragrance of

my exhalations comes from you!—vile matter! I **know** better **because** I **feel** it cannot be so!" Notwithstanding the flower's appreciation of its own beauty, and the scorn it might express for matter, the **fact** would still exist that the difference—in totality—in form existing between the "vile matter" and the flower would be a difference **only** of atomic and molecular structure. No "vile matter" no beautiful flower!

Vain man inclines to attach great importance to himself, amid the existences of Nature about him—delegates to himself much authority in reaching conclusions, regardless of evidence; and, to expect others to implicitly accept such conclusions. In many instances nonacceptance invites ridicule and scorn, all of which, needless to say, is not argument from evidential premises. In their flings of disparagement superficial thinkers reveal a disposition to virtually **repudiate** the very **source** of their existence. There is not an atom in their anatomies that is not material and earthly. Without the oxygen of the atmosphere the activities of their organisms could not be sustained an instant; without water and various forms of food composed of moving elemental units identical to those in motion throughout the universe, they would soon cease to exist. And yet they decry materialism and materialists! All their thoughts, noble and ignoble, all their ideals, however lofty; all their aspirations and inspirations simply reveal varying temporary states of brain matter. Moreover they are respectfully advised that they are not within sight of a monopoly of lofty ideals and humanitarian impulses, nor of a monopoly of appreciation of all that is good, beautiful, and refined, as revealed by the processes of Nature; that the rational materialists of science (not the irrational votaries of pseudo-science and false philosophies) observe the necessity for constructive human action; observe

the constant conflict of constructive and destructive influences arising from the processes of Nature, and draw lines of discrimination and endeavor to profit thereby. They **love** that which is sublime and beautiful in Nature; they revere reason, justice, virtue and all forms of human goodness, **because** all these are arrayed on the constructive side of human existence; they recognize man's responsibility to man for all the influences, good and evil, exerted by mankind. They have no use for the term "divine" in any other sense than that denoted by the noblest and most inspiring sentiments and acts, as phenomenally expressed by highly organized brain matter; **because** in the absence of such brain matter—evolved during a long period of time—there could be manifested **no** noble, inspiring, and altruistic sentiments. If lofty human thoughts be "divine," they are naturally so; they are not known to be imported from extraneous sources.

Those who choose to repudiate the very material source of their existence and derisively regard materialism and materialists do so, either because of what has been conjectural, unfounded in fact, and superficial in their educational training, or of a desire to cater to popular fallacies. However, it would be uncharitable to condemn them. The more reasonable procedure would be to petition them kindly to tarry, now and then, with the data of materialism as revealed by science, and not endeavor to repudiate the source of their existence.

REFLECTIONS UPON HUMAN EXISTENCE

How few the years that measure the lives and activities of the generations of mankind, as they come and depart, in comparison with the ages that have elapsed since that far-off time when earthly conditions made possible the evolution of primary organisms from inorganic elements! How few those of the individual compared with the years to come ere man shall reach his highest possible development amid earthly conditions, assuming always the evolutionary progress of the race will continue! Many thousands of years must pass before the rational and moral development of the race as a whole will reach its highest mark under favorable influences.

Humanity of the present is the **heir** of all the ages of organic life that have gone before. Humanity, individually and collectively—at any given period—reveals the exact effects of antecedent causes. The stupendous mechanism of the universe, of which the earth is but one of the countless minor parts, involves no elements of chance. Humanity came not by chance, nor by supernatural fiat, but in accord with the orderly and necessary operations of that something which moves and occupies space. Humanity is a part, however small, of that something—matter, substance, or whatever it may be termed.

The passing moments are present and divide the past from the future. The joys and sorrows of the

present are the outcome of the past; so with the totality of the good and ill that humanity exemplifies at the passing of every instant.

The paramount consideration of every human life should be to recognize the duties of life and diligently strive to perform them. All duties or obligations arise from the natural relations existing between all the individuals of society. Upon the discharge of these obligations the welfare of humanity must ever depend. The state of society at any given period of time represents the potency of the collective influences of all its units in so far as they relate to the various conditions of society, as a whole. Those who live and move about on the face of the earth are to a very considerable degree enjoying the fruitage of the love, labor, and sacrifices and struggles after higher and better things, of those who have lived their lives and passed away. Obviously, therefore, the generation now on the stage of existence is under serious obligations to generations yet unborn that must perforce perform their parts in the drama of life. The discharge of these obligations must begin with the ever-present. The past is gone forever; only the future remains. Every obligation or duty rightly performed is one step in the right direction, one influence that assists the individual and other individuals, directly or indirectly, to help make this a better world to live in now and a better world for those who will take our places when our journeyings and our labors are ended. Lives devoted to usefulness, to the discharge of the simple yet manifold duties and obligations imposed upon each and all, are the lives that perpetuate the most helpful, the happiest and best influences arising from earthly conditions, affecting mankind.

Real success in life depends upon the amount of rational satisfaction and happiness derived from the

various and rightful activities common to mankind. The seeds of satisfaction and happiness that contribute to success do not germinate amid influences which, in their effect upon humanity, are baneful, demoralizing, destructive. Happiness is elusive. Those who expect to find it in idleness, dissipation, mere frivolities, or in immoral acts will realize disappointment, unhappiness and remorse. Success, in a higher sense, cannot be estimated from the standpoint of wealth, since satisfaction, happiness, and contentment of mind are not purchasable with money. Real success in life follows the faithful discharge of the obligations and duties imposed by human relationships, and the satisfaction and happiness associated with vigorous physical, intellectual, and moral effort.

SCIENCE

The term science, in its true application, denotes accurate observation, the clear discernment and accumulation of facts derived therefrom, and the classification of knowledge based upon verified evidence. Briefly, science is systematized knowledge.

The beginnings of science are traced back to animals, the man-animal obviously included, when cerebral development gave rise to awareness, perception, instinct and intelligence, after a long period of evolution, in which the potential factors of heredity and environment were effectually involved. Primitive man observed the phenomena of Nature and, in primitive fashion, associated and classified, though imperfectly, whatever he observed. The phenomena he witnessed caused inferences and conclusions, since both observation and inference are the outcome of allied brain functions. Animals of any species acquired recurrent impressions from what they observed and experienced and thus in effect came to know, among other things, that some animals not of their species were dangerous enemies. Therefore, whenever the nearness of foes was detected, either by the sense of sight or the sense of odor, escape from impending danger became a controlling impulse, and their means of locomotion were quickly employed. By knowledge thus acquired the lives of animals were preserved to continue their struggle for existence; to participate in the propagation and the further evolution of their species.

Intelligence or the ability to acquire knowledge

and to utilize it, with respect to man, as compared with the instinct of lower animals is altogether one of degree. Within the scope of their intelligence the lower animals are no less scientific in obtaining and practically applying their knowledge than is the man-animal. They reason, in however primitive a sense, from cause to effect. The conclusion is perhaps admissable that if many individuals of the genus homo would as closely observe Nature as do some of the lower animals, scientific knowledge would surely make more rapid strides. The distinct tendency of some forms of so-called enlightenment lead men from rather than toward Nature, observationally and otherwise.

To trace the earlier beginnings of science along the line from remote times to later and more recent evolutionary development, would require volumes. The limitations of a brief essay are therefore obvious.

The methods of modern science involve careful, critical observation in the numerous fields of scientific activity. Reason, the highest and most complex function of brain matter, enables man to reason from cause to effect in contemplating natural processes and phenomena. Science requires essentially deductive and inductive reasoning—reasoning from general to particular and from particular to general. Mere conjecture is not science. The methods of science may and do require tentative and hypothetical considerations, but scientific conclusions are based upon facts derived from unmistakable evidence.

True scientific methods are exacting. Observed inaccuracies and incoherencies are ruled out, except in so far as they may suggest or anticipate final verities. Much that passes for science by reason of superficial thinking, and because of timorous educators fettered by ecclesiasticism, may be in part true, but is frequently false. Pseudo-science—a mixture of

truth and error and not palpable error as a whole—is one of the dangerous foes of humanity. The popular habit of associating authority with those whose real scientific knowledge is scanty, because of their popularity or prominence, is a habit fraught with much harm, in a true educational sense. A scientific truth is such, utterly regardless of mere ipsi dixits and assertions.

The history of the development of modern science is a long record, more or less incomplete as to details, of the vast and laborious efforts of diligent, painstaking intellectual workers engaged in taking observations, in making tireless microscopic investigations, and in collating and organizing facts thus derived, in every branch of science, not excepting those of vegetable and animal life.

Within the past two centuries, particularly during the nineteenth century, marvelous strides have been made in all departments of scientific achievement. Although as late as 1859, when Charles Darwin began his epochal publications on the "Origin of Species," and "Descent of Man," comprehending "natural selection" and the "survival of the fittest," which were in part contemporaneous with the investigations and findings of Wallace, scientists possessed only a paucity of illuminating knowledge, no clearness of vision and no consensus of opinion, with regard to the origin of animal species, including that of man. Lucretius, a Greek philosopher who lived 500 years before what is termed the Christian era had, with marvelous intuition and prophetic cleverness, anticipated a number of the facts of modern science. In later centuries other minds entertained similar conceptions but, respecting the gradual evolution of animals during a long period of time from remote ancestors, it was Darwin and Wallace who set the scientific world aflame—rocked

theology on its very foundation and brought forth tumultuous, vehement, and bitter denunciation. During the earlier part of the nineteenth century, other branches of science were developing with some rapidity, and since then their progress has been accelerated. Now scientific knowledge has become so generalized as to be interwoven with a majority of the undertakings of mankind in the more advanced quarters of the globe.

To enumerate the results wrought by the painstaking and incessant labors of those engaged in obtaining and collating scientific knowledge, and of those employed in applying information derived therefrom to the practical needs of mankind, would be a long and laborious task, and such an undertaking cannot therefore, in very large part, be attempted here. A few generalizations must suffice:

Purely rational theories with respect to the origin of the solar system, constitute one of the gifts of science to man. The verified astronomical knowledge relating to the character, mutual attractions, and orbital movements of the various members of the system, and of the system itself, reflects great credit upon the intellectual genius of a few master minds. That firmly established astronomical knowledge bearing upon the evolution of solar systems and planets from nebulous matter in spiral or vortex movement should, in due course of time, be followed by definite knowledge respecting the evolution of all forms of vegetable and animal life on our planet, appears to be the logical result of following well-determined lines of observation and investigation respecting Natural processes.

Other bequeathments of science to mankind are as follows:

Geology, as outlined in standard works on the subject, affords a wealth of knowledge as to the super-

imposed rock formations of the earth, and the way in which they came to be formed as they are, while paleontology supplies a vast fund of the most dependable data upon which to estimate the time when the numerous fossils found in the various or successive rock formations were in part the anatomies of animals now long extinct, as well as of species existing to-day.

Chemistry, inorganic and organic, in its various branches is the source of a great volume of systematized knowledge that is being constantly utilized in almost every department of practical human effort. Chemists not only deal with atomic-molecular combinations in the formation of innumerable inorganic compounds, but have for some years been applying their knowledge in the great domain of chemico-biological investigation, until it is no longer a reckless guess that the time will come when the origin of organic life, with all the elements and other complexes therewith associated, will be as fully comprehended as are any other established facts of Nature. Advanced biology treats of organic life as having been evolved from inorganic matter.

Anatomy and physiology, both of the most vital import, in that they relate directly and indirectly to the well-being of humanity, are in very considerable part no longer complications of unsystematized knowledge, plus guesswork.

The achievements of the surgery of science, and of the sciences and arts dealing with the prevention and cure of diseases, and the alleviation of human suffering are a great and continuous boon to mankind. The employment of anæsthetics, one of the many instrumentalities discovered by scientific investigation, has saved or prolonged millions of lives. In common with the utilization of various other revelations of science, the use of anæsthetics to avert extreme suffer-

ing during surgical operations, was sternly opposed as contrary to an "inspired" injunction in sacred literature.

Physiological psychology and psychophysics, relating to neural and cerebral activities, are gradually exposing the groundlessness and absurdity of metaphysical psychology or the "ology" of originating and weaving together attractive assumptions.

The dynamics, mechanics, and electricity of science, in their manifold and utilitarian applications, are far beyond computation in their extended service to humanity.

Science has developed a system of blood testing, requiring such delicacy as to go beyond the reaches of microscopic investigation; of chemical method. For example these tests show, in the language of Dr. Henry Smith Williams "that man is more clearly related to the old world monkeys than the monkeys of the new world, our closest relatives being the chimpanzee, the gorilla, and the orang, in the order named."

Science is now not much more than fairly started in discovering and mastering microbes—germs that contribute to the development of organisms, and germs ever at work destroying human and other lives—yet amazing results have been attained. Unimpeded science in many of its departments, including biology, physiology, bacteriology, therapeutics and surgery, will work many miracles in the course of time.

* * * *

The average mortal, engaged in a more or less severe struggle for existence, enjoys the various blessings and benefits of modern science without giving more than a passing thought respecting the source of such benefits—they come so easily to form a part of the daily experiences of humanity that reflection upon them rarely seems worth while. Even those who

openly taboo science or tacitly antagonize certain of its branches, fearing that it will undermine the lodging places of credulity, are not slow to accept every possible advantage which it offers to augment their earthly conveniences and comforts. They accept the contributions of science, provided their emotional feelings are not annoyingly disturbed.

Were the human race to be deprived of the supporting advantages, the helpfulness, and benefits derived from modern science in all its branches, mankind would rapidly retrogress, and the retrogression would be attended by misery and suffering beyond computation. Assumed agencies apart from Nature, with which preposterous claims are usually associated, would prove impotent and futile in attempting to check the backward movements of humanity. Reason and verified knowledge, associated with justice and morality, are the effectual instrumentalities which must ever advance and maintain the most vital interests of mankind; must ever determine the highest standards of civilization.

* * * *

Opposition to the application of improved mechanical and numerous other achievements of scientific skill, and to the application of information respecting the attainment of manifold physical comforts and enjoyments, **is not nearly so strong** as antagonism to the elements of progress which disturb the composure of mind of individuals in matters related to religion, politics, education, and social affairs. The popular application of scientific knowledge has been making rapid progress in utilitarian and commercial channels; in the increase of wealth accumulations attended by many debilitating luxuries, and in the multiplication of contrivances to lessen physical labor and largely increase opportunities for recreation and idleness. Meanwhile, the service of scientific facts relating to the real origin of human

existence, to man's place in Nature, and to his natural and rational responsibilities—morally, intellectually, and socially—has been sparingly recognized and employed. There has been, and there continues to be, much greater concern for science as a contributor to individual and national wealth than interest in science as a means of impressing upon mankind the serious obligations of human existence, or as a rational instrument in the service of man's natural morality, capable of teaching correct moral concepts and natural principles of justice and of showing their application in the practical life of man.

Religious prejudices and predilections, largely of creedal origin and strenuously maintained by ecclesiastical systems and authority, continue to check the popular dissemination of scientific knowledge and the appreciation of the plain logic of scientific facts. Until the truths of science are fully and effectively applied to all the natural and earthly affairs of mankind substantial progress toward the highest possible achievements of humanity, as a whole, will continue to be much retarded.

THEOLOGY THE FOE OF HUMAN PROGRESS

The term theology refers principally to the body of doctrines concerning a supposed extra-mundane God and his nature and relations, which has developed within the Christian church, having the authority of Scripture as a basis. It denotes a formative and directive influence in the domain of religious belief and practice, shaped by an assumed knowledge of the Supernatural.

The theology of supernaturalism postulates the existence of a power or agency beyond Nature and all its operations and observed phenomenal sequences. Starting with this pure assumption respecting the **unknown**, the exponents of theology piously claim to be invested with intimate and detailed knowledge of the supernatural and its plans with reference to the existence and disposition of human life.

Since, however, the supernatural is **not known** to exist, it cannot logically be held to sustain any **known** relationship to the facts and truths derived from observation of natural phenomena.

The accumulation and organization of verified knowledge, upon which all human progress depends, involve the rational activities of mankind. Inasmuch as supernaturalistic theology sustains no real relationship to the rational and natural, it is obviously **irrational.** That which is irrational is the natural foe of that which

is rational—just as insanity is the foe of sanity, though both are the outcome of natural conditions; so the irrationality of theology is doubtless quite as much the result of natural conditions as the rational methods of science. For it is quite as natural for the human mind to deceive itself with delusive conjectures as to accept rationally established facts. Hence, as the foe of science, and therefore of human progress, the theology of supernaturalism has always thriven upon ignorance and credulity, the natural and uncompromising enemies of rational enlightenment.

Mankind has always been largely influenced by mere conjectures and beliefs, and were it not for the balance-wheel of common sense, derived from the very rational experiences of existence, human progress would be impossible. The religious wars which reduced the population of the earth by many millions in former centuries well illustrate the power of emotionalism fostered by theological conjectures.

* * * *

In remote times, as now, mere observation of the phenomena of Nature failed to satisfy the large portion of the human race. This objective knowledge derived by early man from Nature at close range, together with the experiences gained by intercourse with other members of his species, as well as his experience with lower animals, enabled him to meet, in goodly part at least, his earthly needs. But even primitive man could not have been content with these limitations. Therefore, in due course, he found himself engaged with whys and wherefores concerning what was to him unexplicable. His emotions and fears, his limited knowledge, and his rational reflections concerning his immediate surroundings, demanded explanations of the various phenomena of Nature which made strong impressions upon the cerebral portion

of his anatomy. Thus he was impelled to enquire whence, and how came into existence the earth, the sun, the moon, the stars, and so forth. He wanted to know, and was constrained to find out, as best he could. Being devoid of astronomical knowledge the only avenue open to him was that of conjecture. He followed it. When a particular conjecture seemed to satisfy a particular inquiry, he clung to it with tenacity, because it was a source of satisfaction to him; it was the satisfaction of contentment. **Contentment is the basis of conservatism.** He became conservative, and since then has had millions of followers. The more he conjectured the more his conjectural conclusions appeared to him as final explanations, and he thus became, in the vast realm of conjecture, a fanatic in embryo. When he found out that his associates and others could be variously and advantageously influenced by sundry conjectures, he began to regard himself of much importance, and found ways and means, including those of persuasion and coercion, to subject his fellow mortals to his conjectural view-points. Thus theology emerged from embryo as a vigorous youngster, giving promise of much future potency in the wide conjectural field of human activity, where egotism and presumptive assertiveness are accepted as indicative of finalities; where belief transcends knowledge in importance. The birth of theology marked the introduction of the traditions and myths that have by persistent propagation so strongly figured in the history of religions. Moreover, the birth of theology with its assumptive explanations of the supernatural, or the unknown, denoted the oncoming of the age of faith in the efficacy of supernatural agencies, the age of obstinate and relentlessly cruel opposition, on the part of the exponents of faiths, dogmas, and creeds, to the findings of those engaged in ascertaining and advancing scien-

tific knowledge—in laying the very foundations of human progress. How vitally important it has been to the human race that, while theology was being deeply rooted in the minds of men during former centuries, there were here and there those more disposed to scientific investigation and reason than to accept current and popular conjectures—those in whom the reasoning function of the brain was stronger than the conjectural function! The minds of some men were rightfully inclined to repudiate the presentation of error in the garb of truth. They were the skeptics, heretics, and infidels of the age in which they lived. They are the skeptics and infidels of the present age, and are much more numerous than in former times.

While theology enthralled the minds of great numbers of believers, the men of a scientific bent of mind were gradually gaining strength, and the very opposition that was intended to destroy their influence ultimately contributed to it—illustrating as it were the successful outcome of a "struggle for existence" on the part of those who reasoned and sought evidence in preference to conjectures and superstitious faith. Nevertheless, theology came to be a monstrous hindrance to human progress because its influence was destructively arrayed against the acquisition and dissemination of any fact or truth of science which appeared to question the validity of theological claims or conclusions however inherently preposterous and absurd. Thus it stood, and continues in large part to stand, in opposition to human knowledge based upon rational, verified evidence. Thousands of tons of scholarly volumes treating of the labyrinthian and brain-befuddling mysteries of the supernatural, assumed to be made plain by ingenious conjectures and verbal gymnastics, fill metaphysical libraries for the "enlightenment and salvation" of mankind.

A few of the many possible illustrations, showing how the exponents of theology conjectured in times past, how then, as now, they differed among themselves, and how they concertedly opposed with their vigorously active theological cudgels those who dared to advocate the findings of reason and science, and thus obstructed human progress, follow:

The early fathers of the church, in contemplating with childish seriousness the conjectures, traditions, myths, and so forth, transmitted to them, however indirectly, from Assyrian, Chaldean, Babylonian, Egyptian, and other sources, and assorted, compiled, and partly incorporated in the first book of the Bible, were not in agreement concerning the exact meaning and implications relating to the origin of the earth and man set forth in the first two chapters of Genesis, and which appeared to them to involve very annoying contradictions. However, they finally found compromise, agreement, and consolation by conjecturing upon conjectures.

The Mosaic account of creation in Genesis, as being the actual work of the hands or voice of an anthropomorphic God with enlarged human attributes, seems to have been, as a whole, unanimously accepted by the fathers. It is also apparent that by a very large majority they were explicit in their contentions that no material substance existed prior to the fiat or work of the God of Genesis. This explanation of the creation of all things from nothing was accepted in an entirely literal sense. St. Augustine, perhaps the greatest among the early church fathers, was evidently somewhat bothered by a vague notion of pre-existing matter and reasoned that "although the world has been made of some material, that very same material must have been made out of nothing." Thus, in one important particular, creation was finally disposed of, to the

satisfaction of the fathers. But other disconcerting considerations arose.

The next important question to be determined was the time in which creation was accomplished. By the light of Genesis, two contradictory views became apparent, the one representing that six days, each with morning and evening, were required for the stupendous task; the other, that the whole work was instantaneously accomplished. Much grave discussion preceded the agreement entered into by the fathers that those who contended for instantaneous creation were entitled to equal consideration with those who believed that the creative work was done in six days of twenty-four hours each. There arose later perplexing difficulties on account of the disparity of the two views noted, but the fathers, with their dexterous manipulation of texts and phrases, dissolved the dilemma that confronted them, and this dual view of creation became absolutely authoritative during the Middle Ages. Luther, famous for having inaugurated the great Reformation, and not infrequently able to master perplexing problems, asserted with his usual positiveness that Moses spoke properly and plainly and neither allegorically nor figuratively," and that therefore "the world with all its creatures, was created in six days." And then he turned about and contended how, by a great miracle, the whole of creation was also instantaneous. Melancthon, another prominent figure during the period of the Reformation, also accepted the conflicting views as being in harmony, citing the text: "He spake and they were made." Calvin opposed the idea of instantaneous creation by showing, to his own satisfaction at least, that the world was not quite six thousand years old and nearing its end, and saying that "creation was extended through six days that it might not be tedious for us to occupy the whole of life in the consideration of it."

How creation came about from nothing, and the time required for the undertaking having been definitely fixed, the theologians proceeded to establish the exact date of creation. After the great minds of the church had profoundly conjectured, the grave and significant conclusion was reached that "heaven and earth, centre and circumference, was created all together, in the same instant, and clouds full of water," and that "this work took place and man was created by the Trinity on October 23, 4004 B. C., at nine o'clock in the morning." It is of very significant interest to note that for many centuries previous to this momentous decision of the church fathers, regarding the exact "time" of creation, there was in existence on "October 23, 4004 B. C., at nine o'clock in the morning" a highly developed civilization in the cities of Egypt, and that a similar state of civilization also existed at the same time in Asia. It is only fair to assume that the early church fathers were not in possession of this information in course of their conclusive deliberations respecting the exact date and hour when "the heavens and the earth and all that in them is" were instantly catapulted into existence from nothing! This conclusion is quite specific in its definiteness. However, the use of the term Trinity, with its implications, gave rise to more discussion, some of the theologians maintaining that the words "Let us make" in Genesis meant that the entire Trinity directly created all things, while others announced the conclusion that "peculiar combinations of two persons of the Trinity did the work," despite the Anathasian creed which launched condemnation against all who should "confound the persons" or divide the substance of the Trinity.

While the fathers of the church were determining conjectural conclusions, evolutionary theories were de-

veloping. In the sixteenth century Giordano Bruno, an Italian monk, clearly anticipated the "nebular hypothesis." This was more than the theologians could tolerate. The Inquisition at Rome decreed his murder, and his ideas appeared to vanish with his body, which was consumed by the flames ignited by theology.

Ideas, containing germs of truth, may vanish for a period, but not finally. Between the two centuries separated by Bruno's death, came in the order mentioned, Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, and Newton, and when their works were completed the old theological account of the creation of the universe had been torn to shreds, even though the theologians of that period failed to appreciate the fact; even though many theologians of the present day are unable, or unwilling to grasp the significance of the great and permanent achievements of the five intellectual giants named. Throughout the realm of theology rang the outcry against "atheism" and a fierce war raged, with the ignorance and credulity of the masses enlisted in support of the theologians and their elaborate conjectures. Therefore, the science of the early masters was compelled to halt at times and then move slowly. Those who thought in terms not understood by the credulous and ignorant loved life, like other mortals. They naturally felt that their living anatomies should not become fuel for fires of the Inquisition, though many of them perished, rather than recant.

The consensus of theological teaching relating to the creation of animals became firmly established, with a few dissenters here and there. The great authority of Luther distinctly favored the **literal** acceptance of Scripture as the main source of natural science. He asked "Why should Moses use allegory when he is not speaking of allegorical creatures or an allegorical world, but of real creatures, and a visible world, which can

be seen, felt and grasped? Moses called things by their right names. * * * * I hold that the animals took their being at once upon the word of God, as did also the fishes of the sea."

To present very briefly the many thousands of instances of theological vengeance inflicted, with or without fatal consequences, upon those who, through the light afforded by the accumulation of scientific knowledge, or upon those whose common sense rejected the credulous assumptions of theology, would require volumes. In creating, stimulating, and propagating among the ignorant and credulous religious creeds and revengeful fanaticism the theology of supernaturalism, as revealed in the earlier centuries of Christianity, lead Oswald to declare: "The blood of thirty millions of our fellowmen cries out against the nature-hating fanatic who inculcated the belief in the sinfulness ('original sin') of our natural instincts, the guilt of scepticism, and the possibility of Satanic incarnations! Christianity has turned whole nations of freedom-loving men into slaves and flunkeys. * * * The worst tyranny that ever oppressed the children of this earth was perpetuated in the name of the Christian God!"—the God of the theologians. Shelly, the natural philosopher and poet, in summarizing his conclusions, respecting the destruction of human life through the various agencies employed by the exponents and devotees of theology, eventually involved in Christianity as the source and fostering support of atrocious credulity, says: "2,000,000 were butchered in the wars against the pagan Saxons, Sarmatians, and Scandanavians; 1,000,000 in the wars against the Arian heretics; 5,000,000 in the Crusades; (the Spanish Saracens were exterminated); 1,000,000 in the man-hunt against the Albigenses, Huguenots, Waldenses, the Netherland insurgents and the Thirty Year's War; 1,000,000 by

the 'Holy Inquisition'; 9,000,000 for witchcraft—all slaughtered through the fiendish fanaticism and hellish hate of the pious bigots"—representing the theology that found Scriptural warrant, in part, in the following sayings attributed to the Christ of the New Testament: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth, **but a sword!**"—(St. Matthew). "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."—(St. Luke). The authority for the torturing and murdering of witches rested on the Biblical statement: **"Suffer not a witch to live."** After the Reformation Protestantism shared with Roman Catholicism in the destruction of human life. John Calvin, the founder of Presbyterianism, was instrumental in causing the life of Servetus to be extinguished at the stake because he had the temerity to dispute one or more of the dogmas of the theology enunciated by Calvin. When the "godly" Puritan fathers came to the shores of the United States to escape religious persecution they soon adopted the methods of their former persecutors and exercised their newly found liberty (for themselves only) by burning witches—to the perpetual disgrace of Massachusetts. In their lust for persecutions they banished, among others, Roger Williams, who took a leading part in founding the State of Rhode Island.

The advent of nearly every branch of science precipitated the violent opposition of supernaturalists. They denounced the astronomy of science, the geology of science, the chemistry of science, the anthropology and paleontology of science, the psychology of science, the pathology of science, the surgery of science, the anaesthetics of science and practically all that pertained to the more or less scientific diagnosis and treatment of diseases. In fact they could be depended upon to

decry, ridicule, anathematize, or issue bulls against any branch of science they deemed at variance with Scriptural texts and popular creeds and dogmas. Nearly every page of the history of theology is blurred and blackened by recorded instances of vengeance inflicted upon those who for any reason, scientific of other, questioned current theology, thus unmistakably showing that supernaturalism has always been piously and with much unction engaged in either retarding or attempting to destroy the progressive and helpful influences of scientific knowledge and in retarding the progress of humanity. Even now, in the first quarter of the twentieth century, the exponents of supernaturalism tenaciously adhere in large part to the theological dicta of earlier centuries. True enough, some of them, influenced by "higher critics" of Bible texts and the enlightenment of mankind through the application of rational knowledge, are much more humane, more cautious, and obviously more cunning. However, those who nurture the notion that theological monstrosities are principally of the past indulge in superficial views.

Present day theology from the orthodox standpoint will now be considered:

Theologians for the most part continue insistently to contend that the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, is the inspired word of God, in all particulars, and in its totality.

They still insist upon the accuracy of the account of creation contained in Genesis; upon the unmythical character of the Garden of Eden and Adam and Eve. They fail to see anything humorous or primitive in the successful tempting of Eve by a snake, the consequent "fall" of the first parents of the human race and the introduction of **"original sin."** They perceive in the Hebraic account of the flood nothing in common with other flood myths, and accept with literalness the Munchau-

sen story of Jonah and the big fish. They believe that Joshua interposed a check upon the movement of a member of the solar system, without reckoning upon any disturbance of the "celestial" mechanism of Nature. They find no apparent difficulty in accepting the New Testament accounts of the "miraculous conception" of Jesus, the miracles he is reputed to have performed, his crucifixion and resurrection after three days, and his ascension into heaven.

While quite apparently devoid of humor, and oblivious to historical evidence, the verbose exponents of theologico-Biblical means of ensuring escape from eternal punishment and entrance into eternal bliss continue to disregard the natural goodness of mankind. No theological doctrine so monstrously inhuman and diabolical was ever evolved in the brain of man as that respecting eternal punishment for the struggling inhabitants of earth after a fleeting existence here. The fear and mystery which it has caused among masses of people is beyond calculation. In very truth it must have been the creation of a diseased brain, augmented in its aberrant functioning by diseased digestive organs. If, in this twentieth century a fanatic were for the first time seriously to propose and seek to disseminate such a dogma he would at once become a ripe subject for a commission in lunacy. No doubt of it! He would be regarded as evidencing mental alienation in a most aggravated form. Even among the most illiterate the influence of this heinous dogma of delusion has been an ultimate failure considered as a "moral agent." For as a matter of fact it is their all too limited knowledge of the natural effects and consequences to those in the flesh, flowing from evil or wrongful deeds, that effectually and continuously figures as a preventive of such acts. Granted that acute fear like that aroused by picturing a lurid theological hell may serve

as a spasmodic deterrant of immorality or as a stimulant to orthodox faith, the preponderance and execrative influences of such a frightfully diabolical dogma suppress any consequences of a humanly uplifting kind.

Another theological dogma, indicative of a diseased condition of the anatomy of its creator, is the Calvanistic doctrine of "foreordination" or "predestination." This, in effect, makes it appear that "from the foundation of the world God has predestined" a determinate, if not large proportion of the human race, to a place of eternal damnation where the "flames ascend forever," thus extirpating all hope here and hereafter for those predestined to "endless torment."

Again it may well be said that it is impossible to calculate how much suffering and misery have been thrust upon millions of really and naturally good people by reason of the propagation of this iniquitously debased doctrine. Even many of the most pious devotees of theology were in times past, and are no doubt even now, frequently and greatly distressed by the theological possibility or probability of their suffering the eternal torments of hell.

While the frightfulness of fear has been in a certain measure eliminated from pulpit exhortations, the dogmas of eternal punishment and predestination have by no means been excluded from ecclesiastical sources of orthodox theology. If those in authority, in whom is vested the power to change or obliterate the dogmas, doctrines and creeds of theology, are making any real progress the information of such theological progress is not current. No doubt they are sufficiently wily to be aware of the danger associated with such action. For it must follow that dogmas stoutly claimed to be the outcome of scholarly interpretations of the Holy Scriptures—altogether inspired of God—cannot be separated from the theology of supernaturalism without

doing violence to the chief dogma of "inspiration," or call into very serious question the capability and scholarship of theological interpreters of the Bible. It continues to be a fact that paranoiac exponents of endless torment for the wicked and unbelievers, scientists included, are yet popular in many sections of the United States, and their services are frequently in demand where it is thought they can be employed to arouse an increased interest in church work and enlarge church membership by exciting the credulity and the emotional fears of mankind. Some of the ubiquitous exponents of this type are by no means devoid of a keen sense of the importance of adequate, and more than adequate, pecuniary compensation for their noisy and uncouth demonstrations, recklessness of speech, and displays of crass ignorance respecting rational, verified knowledge. In some instances rude insolence and vulgar deportment are associated with frenzied expostulations in holy places.

The egoism, unction, and intruding officiousness of those who espouse theological dogmas are frequently in evidence. Their movements and utterances seem to be surrounded by an atmosphere of assumptive authority, and many of their emphatic claims would be grotesque, in addition to being groundless, if they were not associated with matters of very serious human and earthly concern. During the gigantic world war theological propagandists (among the Allies) were very busily engaged throughout Christendom in formulating and disseminating opinions and conclusions quite favorable to theology, respecting the causes of the war. They mixed, as they usually do when the exigencies of theology require it, truth with a conglomerate mass of prevarication. Theologians and their retainers affirmed in a general, though not obtrusive way, that the German Kaiser and his advisers were really responsible

for the great calamity. True! In the next breath they would assert that altogether non-Christian influences were chiefly the efficient cause of the war! False! To the uninformed, depending upon the assertions of theology, and not upon facts, this contradiction was not apparent. But the exponents of theology did not tell their disciples that the German Kaiser was a very devout adherent and conspicuous enunciator of the theology of supernaturalism; that he duplicated and triplicated, time and again, the examples cited in the Old Testament, relating to events wherein the power of Jehovah marvelously sustained those engaged in ruthlessly slaughtering their fellow human creatures, sparing neither woman nor child. They did not. And they made no reference to the fact that the theology of the Kaiser and their own theology were derived from the same source and that both were, therefore, in large part at least, the same in kind. Nor did they audibly or otherwise express the fact that the theology of supernaturalism was a powerful supporter of the German Autocracy; that the Kaiser and his subordinates always maintained a very watchful concern for theology, well knowing its importance as a guardian of autocratic power when rendered subservient and serviceable through the (Lutheran) State church. Theology was a vital and potently influential part of German Autocracy and, therefore, it fully shares responsibility with Autocracy for the slaughter of millions of mankind.

Exponents of the theology of supernaturalism—the self-constituted, verbose, and unctious guardians of the "spiritual welfare" of the human race—are usually very active in promulgating catchy claims, irrespective of the falsity of such claims. It may be noted in passing that a pious falsehood is particularly reprehensible, or even infamous, because the theological authority which sustains it renders it liable of acceptance by those

who confide, without question, in such authority.

During the great war caused by insane ambition for world power, when it was sought to subjugate the people of the earth to the rule of Autocracy, with the Kaiser's theological God in partnership in the undertaking, the God of theology was appealed to on all sides for protection and support. While over six millions of human beings were being slaughtered, while as many millions more were suffering pain and all forms of wretchedness and misery, numberless prayers on all sides were being made, invoking the aid of the God of theology—the God invested, according to supernaturalistic theology, with omnipotent power and able therefore to have **prevented,** by fiat or otherwise, the slaughter of six millions of innocent men, who were in no wise responsible for the starting, or the continuation, of the great shedding of human blood. Imagine the God of theology looking down upon such an awful conflict, a witness of its attendant sufferings and miseries, and abstaining from intervention! And what happened at the close of the awful war? The exponents and devotees of the theology of supernaturalism were, for sufficient reason, almost frenzied with joy, but to whom did the thanks of thousands upon thousands, yea millions, of the Allies go? Why about three-fourths to the God of theology, and the remainder to the **heroic, ably-Generaled boys who won the victory!** What an astounding illustration of man's ingratitude to man!

The reader may enquire: "How can it be that the theology of supernaturalism so persistenly endures in so many quarters of the earth?" The question is in place. The answer: At the very birth of the theology of supernaturalism the exponents and devotees thereof began to associate with their other-world fancies their earthly knowledge, thus obtain-

ing material support for their conjectural claims and vagaries. This support has stood plainly revealed for centuries by substantial evidence in the form of enduring and imposing edifices, magnificently adorned—the master-work of architects and builders, sculptors, decorators and painters. This materialistic support of the theology of supernaturalism also comprises the extensive personal and pecuniary interests involved in the propagation of theology, requiring the organization of large ecclesiastical bodies, with numerous auxiliaries. Aside from the cost of procuring from time to time and maintaining in good order church property, vast sums of money had to be provided by the faithful to support those variously engaged in theological work in all its departmental ramifications. Briefly, the theology of supernaturalism came to be placed on a worldly, business basis, and remains substantially so placed. It also came to be, and so continues to be, the personal, pecuniary business of all those deriving compensation from theological or allied forms of activity, to carefully look after their worldly interests. Perfectly natural. Moreover, the exponents of theology should be recompensed for their efforts, just like other mortals, and it becomes the obligation of the devotees of theology to furnish the worldly funds. But, the theology of supernaturalism has very much more than financial support. What then, in addition, does it possess to hold it intact? Not content with its powerful hold upon ignorance, credulity and superstition it has successfully sought the support of natural morality —enlightened by human experience and knowledge gained outside the boundaries of theological speculation and has utilized this morality invested in man by Nature to aid in continuing its vigorous existence. Despite the dogma of "original sin" theology accepts and makes much of natural morality, and encourages

such morality (while denying its efficacy as a "saving spiritual influence") so long as its supporters do not mingle troublesome or dangerous doubts or unbeliefs with their enlightened natural morality. The exponents of supernaturalistic theology seem intuitively to regard proper human conduct as one of its vitally essential supporters, and yet they damn morality not allied to credulity—to faith in the supernatural. The leading luminaries of theological supernaturalism and their satellites have always been inclined, for sufficient reason—notwithstanding their emphatic claims as to "salvation by faith" only—not to despise the potent influence of natural morality, if unallied to unbelief and heresy. In issues between faith and fact natural morality has always been swept aside by orthodox theology as of no saving importance whatsoever. The only saving hope for a moral person is bound up in a belief in, or acceptance of, the supernatural claims of orthodox theology. Thus theology has always been the foe of natural morality and, therefore, the foe of human progress. And still another powerful supporter of the theology of supernaturalism, is the monopolistic appropriation to itself and to its own credit, of all the loftiest, yet perfectly natural impulses of mankind—love, charity, mercy, kindness, and good-will. All these theology appropriates to itself, and then proudly exclaims: "Behold, how divine!" How well supernaturalistic theology has succeeded by seeking and monopolizing the natural in mankind in augmenting and subserving its "spiritual" and worldly interests, is quite plain to all who will take the pains to observe and reflect. Perhaps the most potent of all the influences which support orthodox theology are revealed by the purely social influences, which everywhere naturally bind together with bands of steel the interdependent units of society. Without these influences it would have been impossible

for humanity to have ever emerged from lower stages of evolutionary development. It need hardly be added that correlated with the social influence—in all that it implies—is the almost purely emotional influence of music, much of which, aside from the intellectually repulsive, doleful, nerve-racking kind, is of distinct benefit to humanity. All that is supernatural with respect to music is derived from the theology of supernaturalism. However, the exponents of theology know the supporting value of music. It is a very attractive and helpful asset.

The theology of supernaturalism abides and while, through the slowly increasing rational enlightenment of the masses, it is lessening its grip upon humanity, it remains a widely potent factor in human affairs because, among other prominent considerations, of the large support derived from "intellectuals" and "popular lights" who remain under theological influences from force of habit and for social and other reasons. Many of these supporters know no more about the Bible, from personal contact, than they do about ancient hieroglyphics.

Taking into full and fair account the foregoing considerations, and noting with emphasis the fact obvious to all painstaking students of mankind that the rational development and enlightenment of humanity is, as a whole, far below the standard frequently and boastfully associated therewith, there need be no wonder why the theology of supernaturalism continues to thrive, or continues to exert a potent influence, however destructive its character, respecting some essentially vital particulars.

As long as human ignorance, credulity, and superstition continue to thrive, so long will the exponents of the theology of supernaturalism claim a monopoly of the natural virtues of mankind and of the material support which these virtues attract, for the glorification

of the divinity incarnated in the theology of supernaturalism.

Verily, (all solacing notions about established human liberty to the contrary) the theology of supernaturalism abides with much potency and must be seriously reckoned with as a foe of human progress whenever it exerts its power, directly or indirectly as such a foe; as a foe of true human liberty whenever it essays vaingloriously and insiduously to interpose its power; as a foe of truth whenever it refuses to submit its dogmas and creeds to the light of investigation, analysis and reason, or whenever it anathematizes, maligns and bears false witness against those who do submit its dogmas and creeds to crucial tests; as a foe to the human race whenever it essays to scoff at or belittle natural morality and deify blind faith; as a foe to human progress whenever it brazenly, or clandestinely seeks to subordinate the acquirement of rational, verified knowledge to the material, as well as to the purely **speculative** interests of the theology of supernaturalism; as a foe of truth and justice when it accords to itself and utilizes full credit for the tremendous and determining influences resulting from the application of rational, scientific, civilizing, and humanly helpful knowledge of whatsoever kind. Moreover, the theology of supernaturalism is false to the truth when it asserts that nearly all that is good and humane in our so-termed "Christian civilization" must be ascribed to the dominance of theology, or when it employs language to that effect. Again, the theology of supernaturalism is a foe, a **very dangerous foe,** to human liberty when it openly or covertly undertakes to **usurp the authority and power of the government of, for, and by the people** to advance and protect either the purely speculative or the material interests of theological supernaturalism. Readers of this

essay will seriously note—if they love the liberty they are now enjoying, and have thought for the welfare of those who come after them—that the theology of supernaturalism has ever maintained a watchful eye on governmental power; that it has and will continue to be clandestinely and vigorously alert in deriving special protection from governmental sources. It has lost none of its old-time cunning, and old-time assumptions as to "divine" superiority. The union of church and state, in whole or even in small part, always has and always will prove destructive of rightful human liberty.

In fairness to the early church fathers and in charitable extenuation of their claims and dogmas, as they formulated them, it must be stated that they were greatly influenced by pure conjecture in the absence of very much verified rational knowledge not then accessible to them. How far this extenuating consideration can be fairly entertained on behalf of the present day exponents of supernaturalistic theology is a question respectfully submitted to the reader for determination.

In conclusion: Those who follow the paths of rational knowledge, the paths of human progress and substantial betterment, wherever they may lead, and who for evidential reasons entirely satisfactory to themselves absolutely refuse to accept the theology of supernaturalism, will always maintain—if they are fair minded—that those who do accept the theology of supernaturalism of whatsoever sort are clearly within their personal, individual, or corporate rights and privileges, and therefore should be fully protected in all such rights and privileges. But, when the exponents and devotees of theology of any form of supernatural religion delegate to themselves the authority to audaciously assume to dictate to their fellowmen what they shall or shall not believe, and when they contrive to obtain such material support of the govern-

ment as is not accorded to all other individuals and corporations, they certainly pass beyond their just rights; for in such manner they become the autocrats of theological tyranny and the veritable foes of human progress. On the other hand, it must not for a moment be overlooked by those who repudiate the theology of supernaturalism, and who flatly refuse to accept its dogmas and creeds, that "believers" are fully entitled to all the rights common to mankind. In other words the individuals who compose the state or nation are entitled to equal rights, quite irrespective of their beliefs and unbeliefs. The importance of this consideration, virtually affecting human liberty is frequently disregarded by those who fail to appreciate the vital import of the liberty they themselves are enjoying.

Full freedom in the exercise of rightful liberty, in thought and action, on the part of all the units of society will ensure the substantial and permanent progress of mankind. Under the influence of such unrestricted freedom the light of truth will eventually banish the darkness of ignorance and error.

RELIGION

> There is a universal tendency among mankind to conceive all beings like themselves. * * * The unknown causes which continually employ their thoughts, appearing always in the same aspect, are all apprehended to be of the same kind or species. Nor is it long before we ascribe to them thought and reason and passion, and sometimes even the limbs and figures of men.—HUME'S NATURAL HISTORY OF RELIGION.

Primarily, the emotion of fear, due to an innate love of life, gave rise to the religious element in prehistoric man. Historical man echoes the prehistoric, the primitive. Man feared before he worshipped the sun, the air, and water, and deified the elements. The phenomena of Nature either attracted or appalled him, and in both ways he was greatly influenced. Vitally affected by light and heat from the sun, he easily created and became a worshipper of a sun-god. Cognizing water and air as essential to his existence and well-being, he naturally conjectured and worshipped the gods of air and water, and in various ways became accustomed to petition, to pray to his gods—the gods he had created within his brain. Through fear of harm from storms and thunderbolts and numerous dangers surrounding him, and to which he was constantly sub-

jected, he discriminated between life-giving and helpful influences and harmful and life-destroying agencies, and he created his gods accordingly, and feared and worshipped them.

* * * *

All forms of religion (employing the term religion to refer chiefly to assumptions associated with what is designated as supernaturalism) are typically representative of successive changes, growth, and decadence. They flourish so long as conditions, of whatsoever character, are favorable to their development and continued existence. When the conditions are no longer favorable, either final dissolution or absorption into other forms necessarily follow. Changes in religious faiths and ceremonies are usually very slow, because of the persistence of the fixed habits of belief and thought of individuals, and the strength of prevailing customs in all communities where religious beliefs are woven into the social fabric. This obviously accurate consideration is frequently overlooked by those who delude themselves with the expectation that the religious sentiment of a community can be very much changed in a relatively brief period of time. Mankind has always been strongly inclined to follow beaten paths, not only in matters of religious faith, but also with respect to all the affairs of life. Intrusions upon established customs invite opposition, because it is very much easier for the average mortal to move "along lines of least resistance" than to turn aside and follow unfamiliar avenues of believing and thinking. It is far easier for many millions of the human race to believe seriously, or passively and indifferently, in some miraculous story or myth than it is for them to take note of evidence that would, if fairly well understood and appreciated by them, dissipate their belief in miracles and myths. In the course of centuries, in countries

where the education of the masses respecting demonstrable knowledge is a matter of serious public concern, changes in religious beliefs and in all other customs are much more rapid than in parts of the globe where educational innovations are largely restricted among the greater portion of the population. Even in what are regarded as advanced civilized quarters fixed habits of belief and custom continue to vigorously resist what may be tantamount to an interfernce with the tranquility and conservatism associated with old and familiar paths. However, change is the order of the universe. No matter how slowly changes are made, universal change is inevitable. Evolutionary progress along religious lines and intersecting lines of thought associated with religion depend absolutely upon an increase in human enlightenment.

The advent of Christianity began a new stage in the evolutionary development of a religion from antecedent forms of faith and worship. Christianity appropriated and absorbed, in a very natural way, parts of the older polytheistic religions which continue even now to influence many millions of the race. It had very active religious opponents for some time in the worshippers of the sun-god Mithra, partly by reason of the high morality associated with the Persian religion. As in many other religions the followers of Mithra practiced the rite of baptism (by immersion) and used ceremonially consecrated bread, water and grape juice. While Christian conceptions were in contrast to polytheistic religions, some of the nobler sentiments that had been inculcated by the older religions and philosophies were adopted by Christianity. The Golden Rule and the doctrine of the brotherhood of man, for example, were anticipated by the Chinese. It was Lao Tzu, a Chinese teacher who declared: "To the good I would be good; to the not-good I would also

be good, in order to make them good. He who rules, ruins; he who holds by force, loses; if you would take, you must first give. He who is tolerant is just."

* * * *

Asia was the source of five of the foremost religions of the world, as follows: The Hindoo religion (Brahmanism), Buddhism, Confucianism, Judaism (Jewish), and Christianity. The writings comprised in what are termed sacred books or Bibles were nearly all the work of Asiatic priests and prophets.

The Hindoo religion is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, in the extent of its influence in the world. Asiatic India is regarded as the cradle of the language, the religion and the literature of the world. There is much reason to believe that, thousands of years ago, there dwelt on the plains of Central Asia a number of tribes, having the same customs, the offspring of one mother race, and that one of the two great branches peopled a large part of Europe, including the Greeks, Celts, Britons, Germans, Scandanivians or Norsemen. From the other branch originated the Medes, Persians, Hindoo and other Asiatic races. There are those who favor the view that the Aryan was the parent race of the principal Asiatic and European peoples. The Hindoo mythology with its numerous parts is divided into the Vedic and Brahmanic, the Vedic being the oldest. Knowledge of the Vedic deities is derived from the Rig-Veda, consisting of one thousand hymns and invocations to the gods, written by prophets and sages several thousand years before Christ.

Christna is one of the Brahmanic Gods. All accounts agree respecting his divine paternity; that he was miraculously begotten, that his mother was a virgin, that he performed many miracles, had a band of disciples, that he taught excellent morals, and was put to death by his enemies. Some able students of an-

cient and modern religions contend with much good reasoning that Christna, in an evolutionary sense, is a link in the chain extending from the sun worshippers to the Christ of the Christians. They also trace close connection between the Hebrew deity and the sun and constellations of stars, and aver that it is much the same with the Christian deity and his son, the latter being often called the "Sun of Righteousness." It is also a suggestive coincidence that the birth of Christna was placed at the time of year when the solar luminary begins to rise in the northern horizon after a season of gradual setting lower in the heavens. The Christmas festivities of the Christians and the festivities of the ancient sun-worshippers came precisely at the same time of year. Buddha, whose worshippers now number between four and five hundred millions of people, or about one-fourth of the population of the earth, is claimed to have been begotten in a miraculous manner without a natural father. The legend, believed in by millions of his worshippers, is that his virgin mother conceived him from a ray of light and that his advent aroused extraordinary joy, even among the birds, that gardens suddenly bloomed with flowers, that musical instruments were played upon most skilfully, but not by human hands. His family name was Gautama, but as Buddha, "the enlightened one," he has been worshipped. The legend also relates many superhuman acts of Buddha, and his ethical code, given by his Siamese followers, is made up of ten commandments. The moral maxims of Buddha are voluminous and extol all manner of virtues and of good and kind deeds.

The oldest Buddhist Bible—Tripitka—was compiled 300 years before the time of Christ. Its basic teachings are self-conquest and universal charity. Menu was the law giver of the Hindoos in much the same sense as Moses is of the Jews, and the institutes

of Menu are in numerous respects strikingly similar to what is termed the Mosaic law.

China is one of the countries of great antiquity. It is the claim of the Chinese that their traditions go back millions of years, but the claim is, of course, preposterous. It is strongly believed in parts of India that China was first peopled by immigrants from the Aryan country. On the soil of China are crowded five hundred millions of people. The sacred (canonical) books of China, or of Confucianism, are the Five Kinds, which include documents 4,000 years old, but mostly written or compiled about 500 B. C. The Chinese consider them sacred but, unlike other sacred books, not a revelation from God, since Confucius recognized no God. His was a religion of this world, summed up by him as follows: "The observance of three fundamental laws of relation between sovereign and subject, father and child, husband and wife, and the five capital virtues—universal charity, impartial justice, conformity to ceremonies and established usages, rectitude of heart and mind, and pure sincerity." Confucianism represents the wisdom and high moral teachings of Confucius, the great Chinese teacher and law-giver. Confucius is regarded as the patron saint of China. His teachings and writings have influenced a greater number of people than any man who ever lived, possibly excepting Buddha. His teachings greatly increased private and public virtue and morality. His was one of the great master minds of the race, and he was excelled by none in the lofty character of his work. It was Confucius who, over 500 years before Christ, expressed one of his favorite precepts as follows: "Do not unto others what you would not have others do unto you." Slightly paraphrased this precept has been attributed to Christ, and is now regarded as the Golden Rule of Christendom.

The Egytian Osiris was the most popular divinity among the masses of Egypt. The Egyptian trinity was Osiris, Isis, and Horus—father, mother, and son. The explanation of the trinity and its three characters is as follows: Osiris is water, especially the Nile; Isis is the earth, especially the land of Egypt; and Horus is the son of Osiris and Isis. The twenty-fifth of December was the festal day in honor of the birthday of Horus.

Mithra was one of the most powerful gods of the Persians. He was the sun or the genius of the sun. His symbols were truth and justice. The Zend Avesta, comprising the sacred books of the Persians, is regarded as one of the important Bibles of the world, though its religion has few adherents as compared with the many millions of Brahmans, Buddhists, and disciples of Confucianism. It was written and compiled by Zoroaster and his followers about 3,000 years ago and it is said that it included 12,000 parchments. The sacred books of Persia were believed to constitute a record of the words spoken by God himself, and much contained in the Zend Avesta was appropriated by Jews and Christians.

The Koran is the sacred book of Mohammedans, who believe that divine revelations were given to Adam, Seth, Abraham, Moses, David, Jesus, and Mohammed—that each revelation in part superseded the preceding one. The Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Four Gospels are accepted by them, but they claim that their value has been much impaired by the interpolations of Jews and Christians.

The Torah (Book of the Law) now designated as the Pentateuch or five books, is believed by Jews and Christians to have been written by Moses under the direct dictation of God. The oldest Hebrew manuscripts include the contents of all the books or parts

now contained in the Pentateuch, the books or parts having been subsequently divided into chapters and sections.

The Christian Bible is made up of two collections —the Old Testament and the New Testament. The Old Testament includes the Torah, Nebiim, and Cath-erbim of the Jews. The New Testament is a compilation of early Christian writings, originally appearing in the various churches of Asia, Africa and Europe. The Bible is one of many books claimed to have been inspired of God. While Christians deny the divinity of other books, affirming that they were of human origin, they strenuously contend that their book is God's only revelation to mankind. The orthodox claim as to its divinity is expressed as follows by Birks:

"Behind the human authors stood the Divine Spirit, controlling, guiding, and suggesting every part of their different messages."

Early Christian influences controlled the making of the Scriptures. When the books of the New Testament came to be recognized and accepted as canonical the terms "Old" and "New" Testament were adopted in distinguishing the two divisions.

There are, in addition to the canonical books of the Bible, many Jewish and Christian books designated as the Apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments. The books accepted as canonical, and not apochryphal, by some Jews, and for most part accepted by Roman Catholics, but rejected by Protestants are: Baruch, Tobit, Judith, Book of Wisdom, Song of the Three Children, History of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, Prayer of Manasseh, Ecclesiasticus, 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees, 5 Maccabees. Out of a list of about 250 so-termed apochryphal books of Jewish and Christian writings (sacred) only sixty-six have been declared canonical and divine

by the Protestants. The two classes of books—canonical and apochryphal—are much the same in character. Remsburg says: "The worst canonical books are perhaps better than the worst apochryphal books; while, on the other hand, the best apochryphal, if not equal to the best canonical books, are far superior to a majority of them. Circumstances rather than merit determined the fate of these books. Books of real merit and of high authority in the early churches were cast aside because the churches either ceased to exist or changed their creeds; while books of little merit survived as authorities because their teachings supported the doctrines which survived. The Christianity of the second century was not the Christianity of the first. Books teaching the new theology superseded those which taught the old; and thus the earlier writings became obsolete. Of all the Christian books written prior to the middle century only a few epistles have been retained as authorities."

The early history of doctrinal Christianity which claimed divine authority from sacred writings, subsequently incorporated in part in the Bible, is the compilation of the conflicting conjectures and conflicting ambitions of men who sought to control the illiterate masses. The early church fathers engaged in frequent and lengthy argumetns with reference to the Trinity, original sin, the immaculate conception, and other doctrines deeply regarded as essential tenets of Christianity. One of the foremost of the fathers was Origen (185-254 A. D.); but he lost prestige and recognition and suffered persecution. Origen virtually refused to accept the dogma of the Trinity. He believed only in a transcendent, immaterial and eternal God, and was therefore not in harmony with the Trinitarians. The great differences of opinion, then as now, regarding the teachings ascribed to Christ were notorious. The

various opinions of the fathers regarding the Trinity and other Christian doctrines, or dogmas, were involved in mysticism and incoherencies. However, the Trinitarian doctrine came to be adopted, temporarily at least, to the satisfaction of a majority of the fathers of the church in A. D. 325, when there met at Nicea perhaps the most famous of all Christian councils. Constantine, who in 306 ascended the throne as the head of the Roman Empire, convoked the great council. He had sagaciously recognized the necessity of bringing together discordant elements in support of Christianity as the state religion. The settlement of so important a doctrine as that of the Trinity became, in the astute mind of Constantine, a governmental necessity. There were present at the council Vendic Christians (Pagan philosophers enraged because of the recent overthrow of Paganism) anxious for argument with the Christians. The sessions of the council were numerous and protracted, and there was much acrimonous discussion. Constantine was powerfully instrumental in establishing the doctrine of the Trinity, using what would now be regarded as shrewd, if not unscrupulous, political tactics to influence a majority of those who participated in the proceedings of the Nicea council. The Trinitarian doctrine combines God the Father, the Son Jesus, and the Holy Ghost—three in one Godhead. But the Council's solution of the problem involved conjectures not acceptable to the Arians, and others, though it largely dominated Augustine (354-430), Bishop of Hippo, who exerted much power in support of the Trinity and other doctrines which have ever since constituted the creed of all orthodox Christians. It was Augustine who strenuously emphasized and securely fastened upon orthodox Christendom the doctrine of "Original Sin" —that man is by Nature in a fallen, sinful, wretched condition, in consequence of which he can do nothing

for himself, not even make a beginning in the living of a decent life, and that his only way of escape from the eternal fires of hell is salvation through Christ. The conception of the "eternal fires of hell," derived from a Persian source, well served Augustine's worldly and "spiritual" purposes.

The New Testament did not exist at the time of the Apostles nor was it in existence in the middle of the second century.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

The chief credit of founding the Roman Catholic Church evidently belongs to Irenæus; likewise the credit of founding the New Testament canon, a selection or collection of sacred writings. It is authoritatively stated that no collection of books corresponding to the existing New Testament was known prior to Irenæus. Dr. Davidson, a Biblical scholar, says: "The conception of canonicity and inspiration attaching to New Testament books did not exist until the time of Irenæus." It appears that prior to that time so-termed sacred writings were not regarded as inspired. Toward the end of the second century the Christians represented about a hundred different sects. It was Irenæus who conceived the comprehensive plan of combining as many as possible of these sects into a great unified Catholic Church with Rome at its head; since Rome at that time was numerically and influentially the most prominent of all the Christian churches. "It is a matter of necessity," says Irenæus, "that every church should agree with this church on account of its preeminent authority." ("Heresies" Book 3). Irenæus made a special collection of books for use in the church. These books numbered twenty and began with Matthew and ended with Revelation. In the third century Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria succeeded Irenæus and adopted the

list of books collected by him. The four gospels, containing four different biographies of Jesus, were bound together because, as Irenæus put it, "there are four quarters of the earth in which we live, and four universal winds." The books of the Bible adopted by the fathers referred to were selected from a great number of Christian writings—representing diversified traditions, conjectures and myths and partaking of the varying individual idiosyncracies of the writers themselves. The selections were made from forty or more gospels, many Acts of the Apostles, twenty Revelations and a hundred epistles. The work so auspiciously begun by Irenæus finally resulted in uniting the three divisions of Christendom and in establishing the Catholic Church, which remained a great religious unit for centuries. But, says John E. Remsburg, a noted authority of Biblical history: "The seams gave way, the divisions separated and to-day stand out distinctly as they did in the second century; the Roman Catholic Church representing the Petrine, the Greek Church the Johannine, and the Protestant Churches to a great extent the Pauline Christians of that early stage. But while the early church separated each retained all of the sixty-six canonical books, save Revelation, which for a time was rejected by the Greek Church."

The comprehensive and sweeping claims of the Papacy of the Roman Catholic Church, as obtained from an authentic Catholic source are, in condensed statement, as follows:

1. That Jesus Christ appeared on earth to "uplift, enlighten, and save mankind."

2. That "He returned whence He came," and that "instruction and guidance of mankind in the way of eternal life" was bequeathed or transmitted in perpetuity to the hierarchal church "which He made the depository of His teachings and which he empowered

to instruct and govern, and act in his name."

3. "Before He ascended into heaven Christ was pleased to appoint a head over His Society and to be vicariously represented on earth in the person of the Sovereign Pontiff or Pope in whom the Church recognizes the most exalted degree of dignity, the full amplitude of jurisdiction, and power based on no human constitution however venerable, but emanating from the Saviour himself."

4. "As the true and legitimate Vicar of Jesus Christ, the Pope presides over the Universal (Catholic) Church.

5. The Pope "is the Father and Governor in matters spiritual of all the Faithful, of Bishops and of all prelates, be their station, rank or power what they may."

6. The Supreme Pontiff "holds the keys. He makes the decrees to be obeyed on earth and ratified in Heaven. * * * He feeds with sound doctrine the lambs and sheep of the Church of God over which he rules."

7. The Pope is the "mouth of the Church. Through him speaks the mystic body of Christ. When acting as the Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, he proclaims the world doctrine or decision on faith or morals, he is infallible."

It must be readily granted that the claims of Roman Catholicism are stated with consummate clearness and positiveness. They appear as irrevocable and final claims and not to be for an instant questioned or doubted, at least by the "faithful." Moreover they do not appear to be susceptible of curtailment or of argument. They are **vital** to the present and future existence of the Roman Catholic Church. They are based upon the story of Jesus Christ—his marvelous birth, the teachings reputed to him by his apostles and

disciples, his crucifixion, resurrection and ascension into heaven. It is of particular interest to note that the Pope is the ultimate, compelling authority respecting all Catholic doctrines, whether derived from Biblical or other sources. There is no room for conjectures and notions emanating from the sheep of his religious flock, or from any Catholic under the authority of the Pope, because in "spiritual" matters he is infallible. Respecting the claim of infallibility, it is contended by Catholics that Protestants frequently misrepresent Catholicism by attaching to infallibility gratuitous and false interpretations. Be this as it may, a reasonably clear line of demarcation must be drawn between "spiritual" power and temporal power to qualify those outside of both the Catholic and Protestant religious kingdoms to determine sundry issues existing between Catholicism and Protestantism. However, it is quite clear to those who are informed respecting the history of the Papacy of the Catholic Church during the centuries of the past, that the Popes have exerted a tremendous temporal power; have made and unmade kings and rulers of mankind; have utilized temporal power in ways political through the crafty and diplomatic application of the "infallible" and the "spiritual" to the very material advantage of the Church. In every instance where the Pope directed the affairs of State the "spiritual" and the temporal distinctly revolved about the Church as a common centre of material benefits. The same observation applies to Protestantism whenever it had in the past an opportunity to make use of temporal or worldly power to strengthen materially its hold upon portions of the human race. Both Catholicism and Protestantism have never hesitated to increase their worldly influence and material gains by placing especial stress upon what is termed their "spiritual" power. Both continue to pose as righteous dictators in purely

earthly matters—affairs of government included.

It must be admitted that as a religious unit, representing great organizing and rapidly developing power, the Roman Catholic Church is the oldest church in Christendom. It is in possession of evidence to support its claim that it was the first Christian church, at least in point of permanent organization. In the course of centuries it came to be the most powerful of all religious bodies because of having its authoritative power absolutely vested in its Papal head—the Supreme Pontiff at Rome; because of the intellectual acumen and religious scholarship of its cardinals, bishops, and prelates, all vigilant and worldly wise in adopting both material and "spiritual" means; and because, primarily and continuously, it has had many centuries of earthly experience in its exploitations in the domain of emotional credulity.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH

Under this head the Protestant Church of the United States will be considered as composed of about fifty separate denominations and about one hundred and twenty sub-divisions or branches of some of the larger denominations. The more prominent denominations, each having over a million communicant members, are: Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian and Lutheran. The term Protestant, as applied to all the various denominations referred to, originated in the sixteenth century, during which time those who protested against the Roman Catholic church, and quarreled among themselves, established denominations to suit the religious beliefs and notions of their respective leaders.

Martin Luther was the central, compelling figure of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and he has been very widely regarded as the founder of Protestantism. He is considered high authority on the

Bible; he devoted much of his time to its study and his translation of it is one of the classics of German literature. Luther's master stroke in his war upon the Pope and minor lights of the Catholic Church was his forceful contention that the Bible and not the Pope represented divine authority. This contention directly denied the "spiritual infallibility" of the Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church and vested the authority, claimed to be possessed by the Pope, in the Bible. It is of much suggestive significance that Luther rejected no less than six of the books of the Protestant Bible. In his "Bondage of the Will" he strenuously criticises the book of Esther, and says: "I am such an enemy to the book of Esther that I wish it did not exist." He rejected the book of Jonah by declaring the history of Jonah to be "so monstrous as to be absolutely incredible." In course of his writings he rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews as not having emanated from St. Paul, or any apostle. He rejected the Epistle of Jude" as "having no place in the Scriptures." Of Revelation he wrote: "I can discover no trace that it is established by the Holy Spirit."

Inasmuch as Martin Luther is one of the very prominent figures in the history of religions it is quite in order to refer briefly, at least, to some of his predominating traits of character. He was a man of powerful physique and intellect and indomitable courage. In him were developed to a very marked degree what are termed by Christians and others "the lower animal passions." He was frequently under the control of these passions and innate weaknesses. There were two Luthers—Luther, the scholar and theologian, the arch enemy of the Pope, the Luther of all Protestant literautre extant respecting his intense religious activities, and the Luther of violent passions, of moral obliquity, and with a very marked disposition to con-

demn in others many of the bigoted and destructive actions of which he himself was guilty. While he dethroned the Pope and enthroned the Bible, and rightly sought to bring it forth from the seclusion in which it was held by Papal power, that he might afford mankind the privilege and opportunity to read, study, and interpret the Bible, as the only divine and spiritual authority, those who took issue with his interpretations of Bible passages provoked his most bitter, vitriolic and denunciatory condemnations. The history of Luther's tempestuous life contains abundant evidence of his ruling disposition to maintain uncompromisingly as finally conclusive his dogmatic or doctrinal deliverances.

This attitude of Luther naturally aroused the opposition of other students of the Bible which his undaunted courage and scholarship had made accessible to them. It was the various and conflicting individual interpretations of the Bible during the sixteenth century that brought into existence a number of Protestant sects, some of the leaders of which were prompt in adopting Luther's attitude toward dissenters and heretics—those who refused to accept this, that or the other belief or conjecture. Strickland in "Queen of England," says: "It is a lamentable trait in human nature that there was not a sect established at the Reformation that did not avow as a part of their religious duty the horrible necessity of destroying some of their fellow creatures on account of what they termed heretical tenets." It is unquestionably true that Luther, Calvin, and their followers carried with them into the Protestant churches the very spirit of intolerance and persecution which had driven them from the Church of Rome. Macauley says the Reformers "dissented from Catholicism but would suffer none to dissent from themselves;" they "de-

manded freedom of conscience and refused to grant it;" they "execrated persecution, yet persecuted;" they "urged reason against the authority of one opponent, and authority against the reason of another."

From the standpoint of rational observation and reflection it appears conclusively true that, whatever may be urged against Luther and other lesser leaders of the Reformation of the sixteen century; whatever of evidence and factual consequence may be brought against the character of the cruel fanaticism of those who condemned Catholicism and persecuted Catholics in like manner as the Catholics persecuted them, and who persecuted each other with equal ferocity, the transference by Reformers of "divine authority" from the Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church to the Bible, **marked** the beginning of a vitally important and significantly progressive epoch in the history of humanity—in the evolutionary advancement of the race. Why? Because the Reformers, though notoriously inconsistent, substituted their own conjectures for the assumptive claims of Catholicism respecting absolute "divine authority," and centered that authority in the Bible; and because they contended for the right of all men to individually interpret the Bible. Altogether aside from their claims respecting the divine inspiration of the Bible, the Reformers (no doubt unwittingly) forced the wedge that established a line of cleavage between the **bondage** and the **freedom** of individual belief and thought. With religious or "divine authority" altogether vested in one person or head, the beliefs of individuals accepting that authority could exert no potent influence in opposition to it. On the other hand, the right of individuals to regard "divine authority" from divergent points of view and interpret it in accordance with their findings must ultimately reveal through free discussion whatever of weakness and of

error are inherent in this supposed and variously interpreted authority. Once a subject, however worldly or "spiritual," is open to all men for thorough discussion, the error or truth associated with it will in time become apparent. Error invariably shrinks from any investigation and discussion likely to expose it as error. The founders of the Roman Catholic Church very shrewdly anticipated the necessity of centralizing all divine authority in one head, and of making the authority of the "Supreme Pontiff" final and irrevocable. The momentous and far reaching importance of the period of the Reformation cannot be successfully disputed. While some of the Reformers and many of their followers were extremely bigoted, fanatical, and cruel, and like most Reformers of all centuries, grossly and sometimes grotesquely inconsistent, they builded "better than they knew." Additional attention will be given to Catholicism and Protestantism in the essay on "The Future of the Church."

WHY BELIEF?

What is belief? The term is frequently used synonymously with faith, both implying similar states of brain matter. Both are to a greater or less degree associated either with statements entirely devoid of facts, or with statements partly based upon knowledge. In so far as a belief, of whatever character, happens to be sustained by rational evidence, just so far is it entitled to credence. Many beliefs current have some foundation in fact because they concern matters relevant to contemporaneous events and incidents of human existence of an altogether earthly character. Pure belief unrelated to the knowledge of mankind, derived from known, actual, and natural relationships existing between man and man, or between two or more objects, is totally unreliable. Therefore, when pure belief is made to appear in the guise of truth, or in the guise of a "sincere conviction," arising from irrational emotions, it may appear relatively harmless, and yet prove very harmful and destructive in its influence. No harm need come from cherishing pleasant and comforting beliefs, or hallucinations, as long as they are not entertained and falsely promulgated as actual verities. Pure belief finds its root in emotions, feelings. It is quite natural for men and women and children to believe in what they feel ought to be or should be, entirely regardless of rational evidence. It is much easier just to believe than look for, find, and utilize testimony in support of belief. However, the line of demarcation be-

tween pure belief and knowledge verified becomes perfectly clear upon close observation and analysis. Non-appreciation of the difference existing between the conditions or states of faith and knowledge susceptible of at least approximately valid proof, is the cause of an incalculable amount of incoherent and unreliable thinking. It is therefore not surprising that at the present stage of evolutionary progress the multifarious cogitations of the human race are in considerble part made up of a vast medley of illusions mingled with the ordinary experiences and facts of human existence. The social fabric evidences the beliefs, faiths, habits and customs, prevalent and popular at any given time, while pure belief is only that, and nothing more. It is not related to dependable knowledge and therefore not to be accepted as factual evidence.

It is contended by metaphysical thinkers of theological schools and by others—adepts at reasoning from unestablished premises to logically unestablished conclusions—that mere emotional feelings and mere intellectual concepts, regardless of evidential support aside from such feelings and conceptions, are verities, and therefore to be accepted as guides in determining the validity and reliability of intellectual concepts associated therewith. These metaphysicians provide alluring and comfortable lodging places for about all the illusions and vagaries of the human brain. They revel in conglomerate conjectures and mystifying mysticisms but usually clothe their metaphysical conclusions in scholarly language, thus deeply impressing those attracted and influenced by their deliverances. If mere beliefs and intellectual concepts should be generally accepted as evidential facts there would be no need for verified knowledge. Human affairs in all their complexity would be involved in one great incoherent mass of emotional and intellectual absurdities. Just what

would become of our race were the actual and substantial affairs of human existence directed by clever metaphysical conjurers and word artists, involves a problem not easily solved. Those who can picture humanity tossed about by emotional feelings and irrational conjectures are invited to find a satisfactory solution for the problem. Metaphysicians are not excluded from the invitation.

Belief in the Bible as the inspired word of God—from Genesis to Revelation—and belief in all the dogmas and doctrines of Christendom derived or claimed to be derived from the Bible, is aroused and sustained in human brains by the aid of hope and fear, and through the emotions and feelings involved in various social influences, such as music and art. Belief in orthodox Christianity exists for the same reason, essentially, that applies to any religion theologically related to supernaturalism. Religious beliefs are passed on like other beliefs, from one generation to another. Emotional religious beliefs are perpetuated, in whole or in part, by the methodical systematization of various earthly instrumentalities (too well known to be enumerated) by which believers are instructed, trained and bound together in religious and social bodies, large and small. A Catholic is a Catholic in belief for the same reason that a Protestant is a Protestant in belief. Both have been indoctrinated, habituated;—the one is a Cathoilc and the other a Protestant and each believes in just what he has been trained to believe. If both had been reared as Mohammedans, both would be Mohammedans and both would persecute, without much provocation, Catholics and Protestants. Training in theological doctrines does not comprehend the use of science primers. Believers are solemnly warned against even the consideration, much less the acceptance, of any statements not in harmony with the teachings of

their respective centres of theological training. Their preparatory theological instruction comprehends secular or rational information only in so far as such information is not likely to arouse heretical thoughts. They are drilled in scholastic metaphysics, not related to the physical facts of human existence. Any statement, not in accord with their theological attitude, jars them. Therefore, their unwillingness to have their theology put to the test of any analysis not in harmony with theological metaphysics and mystery. Their theological habits are fixed; their paths are well beaten. A large majority of the communicant members of all the religious denominations of Christendom have neither the time nor the inclination, on account of the fixity of habit, to investigate the creeds they profess to believe. How many of them have critically read their Bibles or are accustomed frequently to read the Bible, is altogether problematical. They are content with what they have been taught to believe; they are agreeably and helpfully influenced by the naturally social influences incident to the observance of the theological requirements of the churches of which they are members. It is therefore quite natural that they should resist any statement deemed by them antagonistic to their beliefs, or any influence which they might regard as interfering with their religious comfort. They are satisfied with what they have been taught to believe, biblically and theologically, and they feel sure that what they believe **must** be true. Moreover, their pastors and priests frequently insist that they must remain steadfast in the faith to ensure salvation hereafter. They find satisfaction in listening to their pastor, in participating in the various ceremonies and sacraments, and in the enjoyment of music. Should doubts occasionally disturb them they fall back upon what they have been told many times to believe, and what they

wish to believe, so they steadfastly adhere to the same ancient doctrines and stories. If, under the influence of theological suggestion and domination, they condemn or seek to ostracize and injure the character of those who **do not** accept their beliefs, the injustice of which they thus become guilty is reflected much more upon their theological instructors than upon themselves.

Religious belief is by no means a guarantee of a relatively high standard of ethics or morality. Those who maintain and cling to the doctrines of orthodox Christianity quite clearly reveal in their daily lives their natural inclination to perform both good and evil deeds just as all others of the human race do, regardless of religious belief or unbelief. Their moral excellence, or the reverse, is invariably determined by the influences of heredity, plus or minus the effects of natural moral enlightenment, or the debasement of natural morality as affecting each, individually. Those of moral strength in the church are no better than those of moral strength beyond the pale of religious denominations. Those who are morally weak in the church reveal the same weakness in a moral sense as those without the church. Natural morality always and everywhere implies the effectual and practical recognition of the natural relations existing between two or more individuals. When these relations and obligations are much obscured by imperfect discernment and false reasoning, due chiefly to insufficient education and training of the right description, moral lapses inevitably follow. This observation must become clearly apparent to all who will give adequate consideration to verified data. Therefore, to designate a believer in Christian dogmas a good moral person, simply because of his or her belief, would be a very reckless procedure. To designate a non-believer in Christian

dogmas as not a good moral person, because of his or her unbelief in such dogmas, would likewise be a reckless and unjust proceeding. It has been frequently noted that a majority of church members are much better and far more humane in character than some of the creeds which they profess to believe.

There is much room for the exercise of more charity and justice among all believers and unbelievers. The latter are prone to expect more than they should from believers and believers are prone to condemn unbelievers because they refuse to subscribe to Christian doctrines as formulated by theologians. Unbelievers, to be just and charitable, should consider that if their brains had been influenced just as the brains of the believers had been influenced, they, too, would be believers. On the other hand, believers should be actuated by sufficient charity and justice to ascertain why, in an evidential sense, unbelievers refuse to accept their faiths or beliefs, before indulging in denunciatory comment. To refuse thus to enlighten themselves is simply a confession of the weakness of their position. Nevertheless it does not become those who have outgrown some or all of their doctrinal beliefs, to which they adhered in their younger days, to regard unjustly those who, by force of habit and because of fear, continue to believe as they do. Why then increase injustice, rather than decrease it? Why should not all sane-minded persons unite in helping one another to perform the real, obligatory duties of the earthly life that now is, and thus contribute to the welfare of the present generation and of generations to come. After all, it is the acts and deeds related purely to earthly human conditions and affairs here and now which make for the weal or woe of humanity.

Purely earthly affairs are quite sufficient to engage all the serious thought and effort of mankind.

WHY UNBELIEF?

In this essay the terms "unbelief" and "unbelievers" are emlpoyed as opposites in meaning to "belief" and "believers," with especial reference to various parts of the Bible, respecting the doctrines and creeds of orthodox Christianity as based upon the Bible and the theology of supernaturalism.

It is the confirmed habit of many believers to regard with distrust and disdain those who give expression to unbelief. In fact the terms "unbelief" and "unbelievers" are frequently too mild to express with sufficient emphasis the feelings of believers toward unbelievers. The terms "infidels," "scoffers" and "atheists" are frequently used, in an opprobrious sense, in making various references to those who refuse to accept their beliefs.

"Belief" and "unbelief" express different states of brain matter; the resulting effects of these states stand in opposition to each other. To illustrate: A believer avers his belief in "original sin," because a serpent tempted Eve and Eve tempted Adam to eat of the "forbidden fruit," as recorded in Genesis. The unbeliever dissents. He refuses to accept the story as a true narrative, because he is unable to discover any evidence that the Garden of Eden account in Genesis is more than a myth, without a vestige of probability associated with it. This illustration fairly well serves to indicate the difference between the believer and unbeliever. It is to be assumd that both are honest

in their belief and unbelief and that both are, or should be, in good standing as members of society, provided their worldly behavior entitles them to the confidence and esteem of their fellowmen. Both frequently find themselves quite in harmony with respect to everyday earthly affairs. They breathe the same atmosphere, eat the same food, know the value of a dollar and how to earn it, and both are equally prompt, when suffering bodily ills, in seeking the services of a physician; since they both love life and desire to remain alive as long as possible. Both are subject to earthly woes and sufferings. Should it happen that they belong to the same political party they would find no difficulty in uniting in their belief that those of an opposite political faith are on the wrong side—politically. Note reader, how well the believer and unbeliever are "yoked together" respecting purely earthly affairs and all matters essential to their very existence, of which both possess some very definite knowledge. But it is impossible to yoke them together in a belief in supernatural agencies. The one believes in Bible accounts of miraculous occurrences, the other does not and cannot so believe. The one accepts as true that which is entirely repudiated by the other. The issue raised between the believer and the unbeliever centers in the very important matter of evidence—not the visionary and unreliable evidence of feeling or of mere believing, but evidence supported by known facts relating to human existence.

Mere belief is not evidence. Mere unbelief is not evidence. The one is bare affirmation; the other is bare negation.

In recognition of the very great importance to the well-being of humanity of facts and truths well sustained by verified knowledge, it is obviously the duty of unbelievers to ascertain why believers repose their faith

in supernatural agencies—in a power transcending Nature—in a power respecting which they have no knowledge. In fairness it is also the very serious duty of believers diligently to enlighten themselves and learn why unbelievers refuse to share their beliefs, especially if condemnation is considered a fit penalty for unbelief. Penalties imposed through ignorance of evidence are not prompted by just, humane and charitable motives. Therefore, it should appear necessary to all believers to obtain some definite information as to **why** so many of their fellow mortals will not believe as they believe. For the purpose of presenting such information to all who desire to avail themselves of it this essay has been prepared. The Bible as a whole, the Old Testament, the New Testament and a number of the theological doctrines derived or claimed to be derived from the Bible, will be considered in the order stated—from the standpoint of unbelief.

THE BIBLE

Unbelievers affirm:

That the Bible, in all its parts, is the product of human brains.

That it contains no evidence whatsoever of having been inspired by any power or influence extraneous to the processes of Nature.

That it is a collection of selections made from a very large number of antecedent and so-called "sacred writings," derived from various sources and representing current and popular beliefs in gods and devils as they existed in human minds when the writings were made.

That many more of the sacred writings referred to were rejected than selected, and that the selections made were determined by the predilections and notions of the persons who formulated and arranged, to suit

themselves, the books or part of the Bible as it now exists.

That the Bible was humanly inspired, that the conceptions of the Jehovah of the Old Testament and the God of the New Testament are altogether human conceptions, expressive of no power other than that naturally vested in human brain matter and indicative of the same power exhibited by all the sacred writings or books of Brahma, Ormuzd, Baal, Asshu, Osiris, Zeps, Jupiter, Alli, and other gods.

That the Bible contains an epitome of the experiences and doings of humanity some thousands of years ago and reflects the goodness, wisdom, and the wickedness of mankind when its different parts were written, no matter when or by whom.

That if the Bible were read as any other book—not for what it is claimed to be and **is not**—but for the information to be derived from it, for the human goodness it reveals, for the many beautiful and helpful thoughts it contains, for its poetic imagery in prose, and for the scholarship revealed in its language structure, a far greater and more lasting service would result to mankind. To bolster up false claims respecting it, while it is permitted to lie as a mere collector of dust on the centre tables and in out-of-the-way places in thousands of homes, diminishes its real value.

THE OLD TESTAMENT

When men began to create anthropomorphic gods they also began to create devils with human forms, the devils personifying what were deemed the powers of evil, as opposed to the gods in their personification of the powers of life-giving and goodness.

Unbelievers affirm:

That the Jehovah or God of the Old Testament had no more to do with the creation of the earth than any

other of the gods older than Jehovah, and that the earth existed many, many millions of years before any of the gods were dreamed of.

That the story of the creation in Genesis is a pure myth and reflects the entire ignorance of the writers of the mythical narrative, respecting the present day knowledge of the cosmogony, geology, and biology of science.

That Jehovah, like many other gods, was originally a nature-god.

That Jehovah records are not as ancient as those of other gods and much less ancient than has been represented. Elohim and Adonair were gods before Jehovah.

That Jehovah is anthropomorphic (human in form and attributes) as are other gods, parts of his body being spoken of in various places in the Bible as though he had a body in the form of man. His mind was vascillating, and at times was regretful of what it had done.

That Jehovah is credited with the creation of Satan or the Devil, and that he either permitted or could not restrain the serpent or Satan from tempting Eve.

That Jehovah's temper (human-like) was frequently most irascible. Through his angry decrees there resulted a greater destruction of life than was caused by any other god created in the brain of man.

That Jehovah is portrayed in the Bible as a God of war and vengeance; that he betrayed his armies into the hands of the enemy.

That Jehovah approved and commanded great acts of dishonesty and immorality and sustained the worst forms of human slavery. He "inspired" or at least sanctioned the writing of more that is immodest, indecent, and obscene, than any other god.

That the first five and the most important books

of the Bible—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy—collectively called the Pentateuch, were not written by Moses, as orthodox Christians affirm.

That Dr. Adam Clarke, a famous orthodox Christian authority, is quite in error in his statement that "this sacred code Moses delivered complete to the Hebrews some time before his death."

That the book of Deuteronomy was not written in the time of Moses, but in the time of Josiah, eight centuries later. Dr. Briggs, one of the ablest, most impartial, and most learned of modern Biblical critics, presents many facts not susceptible to refutation to show that the composition of Deuteronomy harmonizes with the time of Josiah, including the development of Hebrew oratory which did not exist eight centuries earlier.

That there is no proof that Moses ever claimed authorship of the Pentateuch and that there is nothing in, or outside of, the work to show that he was its author. Renan, a high Bible authority says: "The opinion which attributes the composition of the Pentateuch to Moses seems quite modern. It is very certain that the ancient Hebrews never dreamed of regarding their legislator as their historian. The ancient documents appeared to them absolutely impersonal, and they attached to them no author's name."—(History of Semitic Languages, Book II, chapter I).

That the Pentateuch was written in the Hebrew language, and that the Hebrew of the Bible did not exist in the time of Moses, and that centuries were required in its development.

That there is not only abundant evidence to prove that the Hebrew language did not exist at the time of Moses, but also to prove that the Pentateuch was not written until 800 years after the death of Moses.

That the Pentateuch was written by various au-

thors from traditions derived from various sources.

That the authorship of Joshua, First and Second Samuel, First and Second Kings, Isaiah and of the other books of the Old Testament has been seriously and successfully disputed.

That the book of Job reveals Job not as an author but as the leading character of the book; that its authorship is unknown. The Talmud asserts that Job was not a real personage, that the book is an allegory. Luther says: "It is merely the argument of a fable."

That the claims respecting the authorship of the books of the Old Testament have been in large part shown to be false; that therefore their authority, as a whole, is **invalid.** They represent the work of many minds employed in transcribing traditions passed on to them from previous centuries. These writers were no more inspired than were other clever writers of ancient times, and no more inspired than writers of modern times.

That if all the claims as to the authorship of the books of the Bible were uniformly sustained by conclusive evidence the contents of the books would afford no proof whatever of supernatural inspiration, or of the inherent validity of the theological doctrines based upon them.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

Unbelievers affirm:

That the books Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the four gospels declared by eminent orthodox Biblical scholars to have been written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, in the first century, were unknown to the early Christian Fathers; that, therefore, their "genuineness" and credibility are substantially disputed.

That Justin Martin, one of the most noted of the Christian Fathers who lived and wrote rather volum-

inously, about the middle of the second century, to prove the divinity of Christ, made no use of and never mentioned Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. His writings include about three hundred quotations from Christian writings, but none from the Four Gospels, though some of the documents of which they are composed, including the traditional sayings of Jesus, were frequently cited by the Fathers.

That no mention of the Four Gospels is found in the writings still extant of thirty Christian authors who wrote prior to 170 A. D.

That conclusive evidence shows that the Four Gospels were composed between 170 and 200 A. D., and that they were not written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

That, according to Bishop Faustus, a theologian with a disposition to weigh evidence and think for himself, the Four Gospels "were not written by the Son himself nor by his Apostles, but long afterward by some unknown men who, lest they should be suspected of writing things they knew nothing of, gave their books the names of the Apostles." The Encyclopedia Brittanica, it may be noted, admits that Protestant scholarship in Europe has virtually given up the popular orthodox claim with regard to the origin of the Four Gospels. It says: "It is certain that the Synoptic Gospels took their present form only by degrees, and that while they had their root in the apostolic age they were fashioned by later influences and adapted to special wants in the early church. They are the deposits, in short, of Christian traditions handed down in oral form, before being committed to writing in such form as we have them; and this is now an accepted conclusion of every historical school of theologians in England no less than in Germany, conservative no less than radical."

That the unreliability of oral traditions as being evidential of facts should appear very obvious to any person accustomed to weighing evidence; that traditions handed down by word of mouth from one generation to another are not entitled to credence unless they carry with them strong elements of probability; that traditional miracles, in contradiction of all that is known of natural processes, ought not to be regarded as other than the imaginary creations of untutored minds.

That the authorship of other portions of the New Testament has been successfully disputed, that the authenticity of the books of the New Testament is not much better attested than that of the Old. It may further be added that John E. Remsburg, in his able and painstaking investigations respecting the "Authenticity of the Bible," finds that "of the sixty-six books of the Bible at least fifty are anonymous or forgeries. To teach that these books are divine, and to accept them as such, denotes a degree of depravity on one hand, or an amount of credulity on the other, that are not creditable to a moral and enlightened people."

Unbelievers positively disbelieve the myths and miracles narrated in the Bible, such as

The Garden of Eden story. The flood.

The tale of a gale of wind that caused the sea "to go back," divide the waters and make of their bottom dry land upon which the Israelites went forward between walls of water.

The miracle of converting a rod held by Moses into a snake and the re-conversion of the snake into a rod. The miracle of Aaron casting his rod before Pharaoh, when it became a serpent; again the miracle that Aaron "smote the waters that were in the sea and turned them into blood."

The miracle of Aaron smiting with his rod the dust

of the earth, so that it became "lice on man and beast."

The performance of Joshua, at whose command the sun stood still upon Gideon until his people avenged themselves upon their enemies.

The human loquacity of Balaam's ass.

The Jonah and the great fish narrative.

The miracle claimed to have been wrought by Jesus in the raising of Lazarus to life after he had lain in his grave for four days.

The miraculous conception of Mary.

The miracle of the bodily resurrection of Jesus three days after his crucifixion on the cross, and the miracle of his bodily ascension to heaven.

Unbelievers flatly refuse to accept as true the accounts of all miracles because a miracle explicitly contradicts in totality all that is known of the processes of Nature. The proof of just one miracle would convert unbelievers into believers in miracles. The possibility of a miracle must first be established. David Hume's argument (never answered) is that "a miracle is a violation of the laws of Nature; and, as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience as can possibly be imagined."

Unbelievers are authoritatively advised that the Bible-theological doctrines that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and that he was materially resurrected on the third day after his crucifixion, are regarded by Bible scholars as proofs of their late origin, because they were not known to the Christians of the first century and unknown before the Four Gospels were written and falsely ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

Unbelievers are forced to note the conflicting testimony contained in the Bible. Professor Wilbur F.

Steele, a noted Christian scholar says: "Evidently every letter of the English Bible has not been miraculously watched over. He who has neither eyes nor conscience may affirm it, but persons provided with these cannot. If the affirmer hedges by saying he did not refer to translations but to the 'original' we note (1) that translations are the only thing most people have to go to heaven on; and (2) that scholars of truth and conscience find equally as much fault with the 'original.' There are hundreds, if not thousands, of places in which the scholar finds conflicting testimony."

In reading the Bible unbelievers find that the conceptions of so-termed inspired writers not only included numerous gods, but were in conspicuous conflict as to their concepts of the God of the Hebrews. The reader will note the following illustrations:

"Do not I fill the heaven and earth? saith the Lord.—Jeremiah XXIII, 24.

"The heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain him."—Second Chronicles II, 6.

"If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me."—Psalms CXXXIX, 8-10.

Thus is the omnipresence of God conceived. Consider the following concepts to the contrary:

"The Lord was not in the wind * * * the Lord was not in the earthquake."—I Kings XIX, 11.

"And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod."—Genesis IV, 16.

"And he said unto Balak, stand here by thy burnt offering, while I meet the Lord yonder."—Numbers XXIII, 15.

"Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze."—Ex. XIX, 21.

"God is come into the camp. And they said, Woe unto us! For there hath not been such a thing before." —First Samuel IV, 7.

The reader will also note the following contradictory conceptions of God:

God is omnipotent—

"With God all things are possible."—Matt. XIX, 26.

"There is nothing too hard for thee."—Jeremiah XXXII, 17.

For the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth."—Rev. XIX, 6.

God is not omnipotent—

"And the Lord was with Judah, and he (the Lord) drove out the inhabitants of the mountain, but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron."—Judges I, 19.

God is omniscient—

"God * * * knoweth all things."—First John III, 20.

"He knoweth the secrets of the heart."—Prov. XV, 3.

"No thought can be withholden from thee."—Job XIII, 2.

God is not omniscient—

"The Lord thy God led thee forty years in the wilderness, * * * * to know what was in thine heart." —Deut. VIII, 2.

"The Lord said, because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous, I will go down and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not I will know."—Genesis XVII, 21.

God is not changeable—

"I am the Lord, I change not."—Mal. III, 6.

"With whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."—James I, 17.

"My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips."—Ps. LXXXIX, 34.

"He is not a man that he should repent."—First Samuel XV, 29.

God is changeable—

"I (God) am weary with repenting."—Jeremiah XV, 6.

"It repented the Lord that he had made man of the earth."—Genesis VI, 6.

"The Lord repented that he had made Saul king over Israel."—First Samuel XV, 35.

"And God repented of the evil that he said he would do unto them; and he did it not."—Jonah III, 10.

"The Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed that thy house and the house of thy father should walk before me forever; but now the Lord sayeth, be it far from me."—First Samuel II, 30.

Unbelievers note that some of the "inspired" writers conceived God as visible; others described him as being invisible. The "inspired" writers were influenced by their own particular notions and conjectures in writing of that which they knew nothing about.

Unbelievers do not accept the Bible as a moral guide with the exception of those portions wherein it commands morality pure and undefiled. All the pure morality contained in the ten commandments, in the books of the Old as well as of the New Testament, existed and was practiced many thousands of years before the Bible came into existence. They believe that one may find in the Bible authority and defense for about all the crimes ever known to man or ever recorded in the annals of human iniquity. It may thus be held to authorize and thus encourage polygamy, adultery, tyranny, intolerance and persecution, and it has been cited by bigots as authority for the destruction of many millions of human beings. Unbelievers are entirely

unable to conceive of any God that would incite the creatures of his own creation to commit all manner of diabolical crimes and thus multiply the sufferings and miseries of vast numbers of those representing his handiwork.

Unbelievers regard the Jehovah of the Hebrews as cruel, vindictive, changeable and unjust. They abhor the wickedness of Abraham, a barbarian, who married his sister, denied his wife and seduced her handmaid. They likewise abhor the actions of Jacob, who deceived and robbed his father, cheated his uncle, and practiced polygamy. They are Biblically informed that Moses exterminated a nation to secure the spoils of war, butchered in cold blood thousands of captive widows, tore babes from their dying mothers and put them to death, and committed other most heinous offenses. They class Moses as belonging to the worst type of war-murderers in the history of the human race. Unbelievers read in the Bible David's record of foul language, of his record as a traitor, a robber, a liar, as a butcher of thousands of men, women and children, as a drunken debauchee, as a polygamist with wives and concubines, and so forth. There is much obscene language in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament. Remsburg truly says: "There are at least a hundred passages (in the Bible) so obscene that their appearance in another book would exclude that book from the mails and send its publishers to prison. * * * There are entire chapters, such as the eighteenth chapter of Genesis, that reek with obscenity from beginning to end."

JESUS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Unbelievers affirm:

That the existence of Jesus, the Christ of Christianity as portrayed in the New Testament, is enveloped in serious doubt; that Jesus typifies an ideal; that if the

man Jesus lived about nineteen hundred years ago the accounts of his doings and utterances are altogether traditional, and that the traditions associated with his life were similar in character to the traditions of other saviours of mankind who were said to have been miraculously conceived, were born of virgins, and put to death. There is much evidence to show that the New Testament narratives of Jesus are based upon an ideal character and not upon the doings of a particular individual of flesh and blood. Josephus, a voluminous historian of the first century, wrote twenty books. He makes no reference whatever to Jesus except what is contained in one passage of about fifteen lines. That only such brief reference should be made in a history of human events, contemporaneous with the time of Jesus, is indeed very suggestive; and, when it is shown by scholars accustomed to carefully analyzing ancient history that the brief mention of Jesus in Josephus was a fraudulent interpolation—that it was not written by Josephus but incorporated in his work to establish the real person of Jesus, historically, the presence of the interpolated passage gives rise to serious doubts respecting what is narrated in the New Testament of the earthly doings of Jesus; serious doubts as to his having existed in the flesh.

Dr. Lardner in his works, vol. 1, chapter IV, says of the passage in Josephus concerning Jesus: "This passage is not quoted or referred to by any Christian writer before Eusebius, who flourished at the beginning of the fourth century. If it had been originally in the works of Josephus, it would have been highly proper to produce it in their disputes with Jews and Gentiles; but it is never quoted by Justin Martyr or Clement of Alexandria, nor by Tertullian or Origen, men of great learning, and well acquainted with the works of Josephus. It was certainly very proper to urge it against

the Jews. It might also have been fitly urged against the Gentiles. A testimony so favorable to Jesus in the works of Josephus, who lived so soon after our Saviour, who was so well acquainted with the transactions of his own country, who had received so many favors from Vespasian and Titus, would not be overlooked or neglected by any Christian apologist."

In the same chapter of his works Dr. Lardner quotes Bishop Warburton as having declared: "If a Jew owned the truth of Christianity, he must needs embrace it. We, therefore, certainly conclude that the paragraph where Josephus, who was as much of a Jew as the religion of Moses could make him, is made to acknowledge Jesus as the Christ, in terms as strong as words could make them, is a rank forgery, and a very stupid one, too."

Kersey Graves in his "Sixteen Crucified Saviours" gives the names of the number (sixteen) of saviours and their dates of crucifixion. He observes:

"Several of these saviours were said to have been begotten of God and born of virgins; half the number were crucified for the salvation of the world, dying in great agony; and, all were said to have received favors from heaven and were considered mediators and atoning sacrifices for the sons of men prior to the reputed life and death of Jesus. Thus we see that in many nations long before the Christian era the belief in a crucified saviour had an existence. Then is it not easy to see whence the idea was derived?

"That the traditions, rites, ceremonies and dogmas of Christianity were copied or purloined from older religious systems is easily seen. (1) The birth of many of the saviours of the ancients were claimed to have been pointed out by the stars. (2) Several of them were said to have been born in a stable and in a manger. (3) The birth of a number of them

was announced by angels to shepherds. (4) Wise men or magicians were claimed to have visited them in their early infancy, and to have worshipped and made them presents. (5) The 25th of December was the birthday designated for several of them, and has been a special day for feasts and various ceremonies in honor of the sons of gods for thousands of years. (6) The titles of the heathen saviours were much like those claimed for the Judean saviour, including the Most High, the Lord of Life, Son of God, Saviour, Redeemer of the World, The Lamb of God. (7) The legend of the saviour being saved from destruction when all other infants were killed—as in the time of Herod—was handed down from centuries before that date. (8) The retirement and forty days of fasting of the Saviour is an ancient legend. (9) The performance of miracles was attributed to nearly all the saviours, and greatly dwelt upon. Several raised the dead. * * * At the crucifixion of some of them the sun was said to have been darkened and earthquakes to have taken place. The claim that they arose from the dead, from the grave, and from the sepulcher, was accorded to a number of them. The miraculous ascension into heaven was claimed for a part, at least of the original saviours. The doctrine of the Trinity is a thousand years older than Christianity. The Holy Ghost idea came from India. Immortality of the soul was first taught by pagans."—Dr. D. M. Bennet's "Gods and Religions of Ancient and Modern Times."

Unbelievers are frequently reminded of the Christian virtues—faith, hope and charity. These virtues are altogether natural to man and are practiced and encouraged to a greater or less degree by all mankind. But is it not true as Volney says: "Faith and hope may be called the virtues of dupes for the benefit of knaves"? Is it not true that the highest types of mankind, like

Bruno, Spinoza, Paine and Ingersoll, have been maligned, anathematized, or slain by Christians, while the gods, heroes, patriarchs, prophets and priests of the Bible have been and continue to be adored as models of moral uprightness?

To contend that unbelievers have no authority or reason to dispute the divinity of Jesus, to dispute the narratives respecting both his divinity and real existence as set forth in the New Testament, would be an unfair and inconsiderate contention. For unbelievers who emphatically deny the divinity of Jesus, who thus deny the reality of all the miracles claimed to have been wrought by him, and unbelievers who dispute his ever having existed in flesh and blood, subscribe to all that is good, just, merciful, humane, loving, charitable and right contained in any of the statements made by Christ or in all of the statements he is reputed to have made, as set forth in the New Testament. Moreover, they insistently maintain that the practice on the part of humanity of all that is **naturally** good and virtuous in Christianity **does not require** humanity to accept any of the claims of Christianity or of supernaturalistic theology which can be shown to be false, evidentially. This is exactly the position of unbelievers, and it is the obvious duty of believers to reflect seriously upon the position thus stated. It is vitally important that all that is good and true in Christianity, or in any religion, should be effectualized in practice by the human race, but it cannot in fairness be expected of any individual to believe that which cannot honestly be believed because of the want of evidence conclusive and satisfactory to the individual. Believers are expected to be considerate enough to meditate along the lines indicated. Unbelievers by no means insist that believers shall renounce their beliefs, or any comfort they may derive from their beliefs, but unbelievers do

insist that believers shall be fair enough to exercise their common sense and ungrudgingly grant unbelievers the same rights and privileges they themselves enjoy, respecting belief and unbelief, and all other matters. Unbelievers happen to know that very many strong believers are weak in practicing the natural goodness and the natural virtues that inhere in Christianity. Such persons and all other believers are respectfully reminded that unbelievers are just as much concerned about the **real** betterment of humanity as are believers. Unbelievers are as much concerned in lessening human wickedness and increasing human happiness as are believers. But unbelievers, nevertheless, refuse to accept as true the theological dogma of "salvation by faith" or other dogmas involving pure myths and assumptions. Unbelievers insist that the salvation of humanity on earth depends upon the faithful discharge of human obligations, of duties one toward another and that, since nobody knows anything about heaven hereafter, there is no reason to be seriously concerned respecting mere conjectures. The serious, paramount problem is that of improving, bettering and elevating human conditions here and now. The solution of this problem requires the **united efforts** of believers and unbelievers; and it is essential, in more effectually promoting such united efforts, that believers and unbelievers should reason together like full-grown, rational men and women. Without the application of reason, without the doing of right for the sake of right, human salvation from error and wickedness will be impossible.

The power of accomplishment which good deeds possess, whether such deeds be performed by believers or unbelievers, is the power that virtually exalts individuals and nations.

Believers are respectfully advised that if what

they believe is of truth they should cordially invite rather than condemn the investigation of the foundation of their beliefs, and that no statement can ultimately be sustained as of the truth by hurling anathemas. If the contentions of unbelievers are not valid unbelievers **desire** to be advised of proof to the contrary. They sincerely invite investigation.

Whatever of substantial success, happiness, or well-being is derived by believers and unbelievers from their earthly existence, comes largely through the exercise of their rational senses. Why not, therefore, associate common sense with belief, whatever its character, thus affording some room for honest doubt, respecting whatever can be shown to be involved in error.

Nothing of goodness can be lost, and much may be gained by exercising tolerance. Intolerance is yoked with unreason. It is often the boon companion of injustice.

Truth will bear the most rigid investigation and analysis. Intolerance hinders the search after truth. It retards the separation of error from truth. It is therefore the serious duty of believers and unbelievers to shun intolerance and unite their best efforts in behalf of the earthly welfare of mankind.

THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE

In the considerations which follow the term "church" will be used with particular reference to Catholicism and orthodox Protestantism in the United States, and will be employed synonymously with the word "religion."

Discussion respecting the status of the church of the future necessarily involves recognition of historical data relating to the church of the past and consideration of the church of the present.

The religion of the future will not be the religion of the present. No change would result in its extinction. Evolution tolerates no exceptions. Enough good has been associated with religion to save it from destruction in the past. All that is rationally and essentially true, benign and just—all that is beautiful and inspiring in a purely humanistic sense—must in large part serve as saving factors, or the church will ultimately and miserably perish as an instrumentality contributing to the welfare of mankind.

The church of the future will be divested of its supernaturalism and unfounded claims in proportion as the masses of humanity become more rationally enlightened, intellectually and morally; in proportion as the masses become more and more conversant with coherent and verified interpretations of natural phenomena, and the logic of scientific facts.

So long as those who are assiduously taught to believe in supernaturalism, and who are **not** encouraged to investigate searchingly the claims maintained by

their religious instructors, just so long will mere faith form one of the most influential as well as one of the most unreliable supports of religion. So long as the emotions, fears, and hopes of the human race, as distinct from the fears and hopes arising from purely natural relationships, are sedulously cultivated, so long will unfounded fear and hope form a large asset of organized ecclesiasticism.

As noted elsewhere in this volume, the religious habit is deeply rooted and vigorously resists change; but, change it must in course of time. The change will be slow because those who have habituated themselves to conjecturally associate with natural phenomena a directive personal or "spiritual" power apart from or extraneous to Nature, will continue indefinitely to be subjected to influences arising from such conjectures, since it is naturally easier to indulge in habit than to give rational and serious consideration to discernments which afford fruitful evidence of the oneness of the universe and the naturalness of all the power for good and evil that determines the thoughts and actions of mankind everywhere. Rational considerations find their true basis in knowledge derived from the facts of human existence. This kind of knowledge does not exclude emotional contemplations, but classifies them as such, and nothing more.

Social customs and economic conditions will continue largely to affect the church. Religion, quite aside from its pure assumptions regarding the supernatural, is very extensively an earthly affair. The influence of imitation, and the fear of social and financial disadvantages frequently associated with investigation and discussion of popular religious beliefs and pretenses, and the utilization of wealth in disseminating and sustaining religious creeds, continue to retard rational enlightenment. Religion remains a popular cloak for

unscrupulous hypocrites, and a convenient pretext in the furtherance of mercenary undertakings. To attend divine service regularly and participate in its formalities and rituals is a popular requisite in a majority of communities, and much more emphasis is placed upon faithfulness to theological doctrines and religious rites than upon the requirements imposed by high standards of morality. Social and commercial influences unite in sustaining the religious habit—unite in opposing investigation and discussion of religious beliefs.

Notwithstanding the impediments which dogmatic religion strews in the path of evidential knowledge, notwithstanding the assumptive averments of those piously claiming relationship to the supernatural, the march of human events has passed partly beyond many of the religious absurdities espoused and supported during the present and former centuries.

Fifty years ago evolution was ridiculed and piously anathematized in practically all the churches of Christendom. Now the established facts of evolution are generally admitted by progressive theologians (even though they fail to grasp in full the logic of scientific facts) and by church members who have sufficiently informed themselves. Fifty years ago eternal hell-fire was proclaimed from a large majority of orthodox pulpits as the sure penalty for sinners unregenerated by faith in Christ as the redeemer of the world, and for unbelievers in theological creeds and dogmas. Fifty years ago it was widely and very seriously contended that a considerable portion of the human race was predestined by God "from the beginning" to eternal damnation, and that others were predestined by God to eternal happiness. Now, pulpiteers who preach eternal hell-fire and foreordination are perhaps in the minority. The passing of these unspeakably atrocious dogmas

finds church members as a whole more humane and better in many ways (because of rational knowledge) than they were when the orthodox hell was extensively employed in behalf of evangelical Christianity. The illustrations noted will remind the reader of other evidences of religious advancement. The progress in enlightened natural morality will be noted by all who will make careful comparisons regarding past and present conditions in their respective communities.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

There is reason to believe that the time is coming when the Roman Catholic Church will stand almost alone as an insistent and influential exponent of supernaturalism. It was the first Christian organization to utilize and commercialize the natural emotions, fears, and the ignorance of mankind by the dissemination of doctrines and claims based on sacred writings incorporated in the Bible. It will continue to be the faithful exponent of such doctrines as the present and future Supreme Pontiffs may from time to time "infallibly" designate. The Roman Catholic Church embraces more scholarship of the linguistic-metaphysical type, more shrewd business acumen and tact, more successful adroitness in holding its masses together with a vice-like grip, and more Jesuitical diplomacy in adjusting its sails to storms of doubt and investigation, than all other Christian denominations combined. The cohesive power of Roman Catholicism centers solely in one head—the Pope. There is no division of doctrinal or ecclesiastical authority. The Supreme Pontiff is "divinely" invested with "infallibility" and his doctrinal interpretations of Bible texts are final. They are revocable by no authority except that which the Pope alone exercises. Moreover, the Pope is in a large, practical sense the very centre of the worldly

power of the Catholic Church. The mundane power thus vested in the Pope is frequently underestimated rather than overestimated by those who are not Catholics. The whole history of Roman Catholicism bears abundant testimony to the effective exercise of temporal power by authority of the Papacy in directly and indirectly controlling large masses of mankind for the benefit, glory and material perpetuity of the Catholic Church. In former centuries Popes determined who should become kings and bade them what to do, and what not to do. Papal authority continues to be influentially felt, feared and catered to by representatives of the governing power of nations in many quarters of the globe. All its doctrinal power and a vast amount of its temporal power remain vested in the Supreme Pontiff, who brooks no contrariety of conjectural doctrines, or adverse material influence. The Pope has the final word, from which there is no appeal. Those of the Catholic faith who indirectly, or directly and openly dispute his authority are anathematized, if not excommunicated, for their heresy. This cohesive power of the Roman Catholic Church stands out in very suggestive and far-reaching contradistinction to the variously conflicting doctrines and creeds, and to the divided power of the Protestant churches of Christendom.

Another advantage accruing to the "spiritual" and worldly interests of the Catholic hierarchy, and which cannot be associated with many of the orthodox Protestant denominations, is the diplomatic handling of the Catholic masses in matters pertaining to their earthly desires and inclinations respecting recreations and amusements. If they are faithful in their church devotions, in attending mass and in conforming themselves to various other ceremonies, they are graciously permitted to partake of about all the worldly enjoyment they desire. This statement is not intended to imply

that the priests or fathers in direct charge of the masses sanction immorality, either in their exhortations or in their intercourse with the laity. Their admonitions, for sufficient reason indeed, are all to the contrary, and whatever of moral influence is thus exerted cannot be too strongly commended. But what it intended to be remarked here is that the priests of the Catholic Church do not fanatically inveigh against indulging in many amusements and recreations, inherently harmless and helpful, on Sundays. They understand human nature and know how to conserve the interests of the church. After the Catholic laity attend to their religious devotions on Sunday mornings they are excused for the remainder of the day.

This theological conformity to the natural and largely wholesome inclinations of the faithful unquestionably adds much strength to the Catholic Church.

Another reason for the continuing solidarity of the Roman Catholic Church is discerned in the resourcefulness of the Papacy in formulating and promulgating decrees in apparent harmony with "infallible" doctrines. In this respect Supreme Pontiffs have exhibited much diplomatic adroitness. Without harking back to earlier centuries and recounting a number of prominent instances of papal cleverness in turning defeat into apparent victory, much to the satisfaction of those within the church who had become disturbed in faith, one example will be cited presently. The vigorous opposition of the authority of the Catholic Church (likewise of the authorities of Protestant churches) to every important discovery of science, has always distinctly characterized Catholicism and Protestantism. Happily both have virtually met defeat in every combat with science. When the theory of evolution was first definitely and comprehensively advanced by Darwin and Wallace, about the middle of the last century, it was promptly

ridiculed, condemned and anathematized by Catholic and Protestant authorities as being in total contradiction to the story of Genesis in the Bible. By and by the Pope and his satellites discerned that they were being seriously worsted in their warfare upon evolution. Their combative temper gradually subsided and it was finally found to be both prudent and convenient not only to cease inveighing against evolution but to find sufficient reason to harmonize Catholic doctrines with Darwinism and aver that, after all the noise that had been made, there was really nothing in evolution that need to be in conflict with Roman Catholic theology. No matter how absurd and ludicrous the Papal reconciliation of the dogmas and myths of supernaturalism with the facts of science, the reconciliation was far-reaching enough to meet a critical emergency. History will only be repeating itself, theologically, if some day the exponents of Catholicism put in circulation the claim that a Supreme Pontiff actually discovered evolution long before Charles Darwin was born. The head of the Catholic Church thus disposed of a vexatious and dangerous issue, while many of the Protestant exponents of supernaturalism had not yet learned that they were decisively defeated. Of course, all of the more advanced of the Protestant clergy and laity now refrain from fighting evolution and are betimes engaged in harmonizing Genesis and Darwin.

For the reasons stated, there is ground for the belief that, as the Roman Catholic church was the first firmly organized Christian church of influential importance to become rooted in theological doctrines derived from sacred writings, so it will be the last surviving organization of any considerable magnitude to uphold and maintain supernaturalistic theology.

It is earnestly to be hoped that the evolution of religion in the future will not be other than a peace-

ful evolution, devoid of sanguinary conflicts and attendant human misery.

The Catholics are fully entitled to the same religious rights as are the Protestants—no more, no less; and both are entitled to full protection in all their just rights. The intrusion of one or the other upon secular ground to obtain financial aid or potential religious support from the government of the United States, or from any of the States of the Federal Union, **should not be tolerated,** because such intrusion from either source means the presence of the most insiduous and the most deadly foe of rightful human liberty.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH

The truth only will permanently bear analysis and discussion. Any belief or statement that will not survive rigid investigation is elementally weak and unreliable.

The Protestant Church as a whole is slowly drifting toward Rationalism. This conclusion is supported by many observations from unbiased viewpoints, however ominous and dismaying it may appear to devout adherents of the doctrines and creeds of orthodoxy. It frequently happens that those who are rated as enemies of religious systems prove, in the course of time, to be the best friends of that kind of religion which practically results in the continued betterment of mankind. Humanity needs to be informed of unpleasant facts and truths. Without such information there can be no progress. In the absence of verified information there would be no guide posts established in the wilderness of human thought; intellectual and moral progress would be impossible. Again, it is not unusual that those who are on the outside of the church can with more precision estimate its weaknesses than those actively participating in church work. Those bent upon following

beaten paths in religious, as in other matters, are so strongly habituated in conforming themselves to certain lines of movement that they are much more likely to overestimate the value or real importance of their activities than to form approximately accurate judgments. They are not in the habit of diverging from old paths, nor in the habit of viewing much contiguous territory.

It is well for humanity that the drift of Protestantism is toward Rationalism. The drift originated contemporaneously with the beginning of the period of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. Thus Protestantism began to move toward Rationalism as soon as it was born and the direction of its movement remains unchanged.

Though the opposition to Papal authority, and to immoralities associated with various affairs of the Catholic Church was widespread prior to the Reformation, it was Martin Luther's bold and emphatic attitude of mind that especially fitted him for the leadership of those who participated in the Reformation. Whatever may be urged in truth against Luther's tyranny, against the heartless persecution of those who refused to accept his theological claims, or against the moral obliquity of this greatest exponent of the doctrine of "justification" and "salvation by faith," it is nevertheless true that when he boldly disputed the "infallible" authority of the Pope in the determination of doctrines based upon Bible texts and in effect declared it to be the right of all men to read and interpret the Scriptures, he and his associates drove a wedge that permanently established the line of separation between Catholicism and freedom of religious belief.

It is not a long stride from free believing in matters of religious faith to free thinking respecting all other matters. The observation that those free to believe

as they choose are prone to deprive others of similar freedom is, in the long run, no argument against free believing, free thinking and free speech, because error can only be exposed in all its hideousness and truth be made apparent in all its strength and beauty by free investigation and the free interchange of statements, opinions and conclusions.

The Reformers of the sixteenth century established an excellent precedent when they wrangled about Scriptural authority for this or that doctrine. The circulation of the Bible among the masses, the clashing of doctrinal exponents, and the disputations of ambitious Bible readers and students, have all contributed to free faith, free thought and free speech—all have participated in the movement of Protestantism toward Rationalism.

The present status of the Protestant Church reveals much unbelief among its members in good standing. It is furthermore revealed that the church is rather rapidly losing its former hold on humanity. It is not difficult to account for both revelations. Many of those affiliated with the various Protestant denominations no longer seriously believe in what are designated the essential doctrines of orthodoxy. Especially is this true with the male portion of church adherents. They are not in the habit of openly expressing their unbelief. Though not regular in attending church services, their doubts do not prevent them from deriving some satisfaction in whatever they esteem to be good in Christianity as expressed from the pulpit; in listening to the music, and in meeting their friends and neighbors in a social way. They will be ready at any time to welcome the disappearance of all objectionable dogmas. In many instances they are in advance of their pastors, who feel obliged to continue their insistence upon doctrinal beliefs and their horror of unbelief.

The Protestant Church is losing influence because its doctrines no longer appeal to those outside the church who have formulated entirely satisfactory opinions and conclusions respecting religion from knowledge derived from rational evidence. The latter do not, as a rule, assume a hostile attitude toward the church, but they refuse to formally identify themselves with it. They will not subject their reason to faith in the supernatural.

If present indications are not wholly misleading, the Protestant Church must accelerate its movement toward Rationalism or ultimately become impotent and helpless as an instrumentality for the lasting betterment of mankind. Whatever hope there may be for the Protestant Church of the future must be based upon its encouragement of activities which promote the advancement of sound reason and sound morals. It must relegate to a subordinate position matters of pure conjecture and pure faith. Church members should be fully privileged to conjecture and believe whatever they choose respecting that which they know nothing about—provided their moral status is not lowered by their conjectures and beliefs. Many of the notions, fantasies, and delusions arising from cerebral activity are relatively harmless and unobjectionable. But they should not be seriously proclaimed as matters of fact.

The tasks which, apparently, the Protestant Church must accomplish, if it is to escape disintegration and widen and deepen its influence respecting all the moral and intellectual activities of mankind will, I trust, be made sufficiently plain by observations and conclusions contained in the following paragraphs:

The obliteration of the claim that whatever is highest and best in human civilization has been the work of Christianity. This claim is false. The fact is that the creeds and dogmas of Christianity, Catholic

and Protestant, have proven to be a very serious hindrance to human progress, because of their opposition to many of the important findings of science and reason antagonistic to such creeds and dogmas. Moreover, whatever the progress of civilization, intellectually and morally, may have been, such progress has been due to advancing human enlightenment, to the increasing recognition of factual evidence by men and women regardless of their belief or unbelief in the theological doctrines of Christianity.

It is one of the present claims of the Protestant Church that absence of faith in the supernatural weakens the higher emotional nature in mankind. This is not a true claim: Knowledge of the multifarious phenomena of nature stimulates the emotions and affords unlimited opportunities for contemplation respecting the boundlessness of space, the minor part our earth sustains to the solar system and the universe, the wonders of animal and vegetable life, the transitory existence of all humanity, and the obligations of mankind arising from natural relationships. Furthermore, those who are devoted to reasoning, and who have no faith in the existence of that which is termed the supernatural, more easily discern the weaknesses and actual needs of humanity than do credulous believers, and thus are their emotions aroused and employed with more practical and helpful results. The obvious difference existing between the emotions stimulated by mere faith and those of rational thought is the notable difference that exists between uncontrolled and misguided emotions and emotions in a large part controlled by reason. Evil arising from emotions aroused by credulity is of frequent occurrence. It is one of the tasks of the Protestant Chruch to encourage, within rational bounds, the emotions associated with all motives concerning the amelioration of human

conditions, and the true progress of mankind.

The doctrines of "original sin" and "salvation by faith" have proved more destructive to man's natural confidence in himself than all other theological conjectures that have been inflicted upon humanity. In the very nature of the case, those who have been instructed to believe seriously that they are by nature utterly wicked and sinful have imposed upon them an obstruction to visions aroused by the natural moral sensibilities everywhere in evidence among mankind. The sincere belief on the part of any man that he was "born in sin" and that his "salvation" depends upon faith in the atoning, saving power of a saviour, so influences him that when he is not altogether under the hallucinations of mere belief he is more inclined to immorality than if he were within himself under the abiding influences of natural morality enlightened by knowledge of the natural effects (upon himself and others) of whatever form of wickedness. It is of vastly more importance that those who inflict harm, misery, and injustice upon others should make amends to, and crave the forgiveness of, those subjected to their wrong doing, than that they should seek forgiveness from an unknown source. It has always been the practice of orthodox believers to ask Christ to forgive them without making reparation to those actually suffering the wrongs inflicted upon them. This all too common habit is at the very root of a vast amount of evil and injustice. The natural effect of insisting upon "salvation by faith" has been to encourage not to prevent immoral conduct. The outstanding absurdity associated with this doctrine is the theological postulate that no matter how moral a man or woman or boy or girl may be, unless they have full and implicit faith in Christ's atoning power and his power to forgive sin, he or she will be among the damned. This monstrous doctrine—totally unsup-

ported, except by pious incredulity—grossly and shamefully underestimates the importance of natural deeds of goodness and virtue. It fosters faith at the expense of moral conduct, because of the ease of formally praying for forgiveness after the commission of immoral acts. Had it not been for the natural moral sensibilities of mankind in times past the effectual results of "salvation by faith" would have proved appallingly disastrous.

The theological dogmas, as outlined, are passing—are doomed to die, if the Protestant Chruch is to live on and make progress. There is reason to believe that Protestantism will in the course of time endorse the conclusion that the highest type of manhood requires, on the part of the individual, a keen sense of personal responsibility for the effects of the acts and deeds of the individual, and that "salvation by faith" will come through faith in natural goodness, justice and helpfulness representing influences with which to overcome human wickedness of every kind. All that is really good in what Jesus said or did, and all that is good in the Bible must necessarily continue as helpful factors. Mankind will never be divested of ideals to strive after, but the highest ideals possible of practical materialization will have to be distinctly associated with the struggle to obtain the greatest possible goodness and rational happiness for the greatest possible number of the inhabitants of our planet. Whatever there be of the so-called "divine" in Christ's earthly career will be worshipped and emulated, and this is far more essential than blind faith in his miraculous conception and in other miracles associated with his life and death.

A task involving several particular features of far-reaching import concerning the relationship existing between Protestantism and Catholicism, lies ahead. Protestants as a rule distrust and fear the Catholic Church.

Catholics have no love for the Protestant Church. This mutual distrust frequently results in pronounced antagonisms. Fear and distrust on the part of Protestants have distorted rather than clarified their reason and judgment and have thus far prevented them from squarely facing their opponents and straightforwardly demanding the application of **fairness** and **justice** on the part of themselves as well as on the part of their adversaries. Distorted vision encourages them to insist doggedly upon the reading of the Bible in the public schools throughout the country, thus affording the authorities of Catholicism with a strong argument in making appeals to secular government for financial aid for some of their institutions—parochial schools included. The Catholics even go so far as to characterize the public schools as "godless" because Catholics do not recognize the Protestant religion as expressive of true faith. The Protestant Bible and Protestant teachers in the public schools are very repulsive to them. For these reasons the Catholics declare that, while they must help to support the public schools, the public schools dangle heresies right before their eyes. A conclusion not devoid of much current evidence in its support is, that orthodox Protestants, if they could so conduct secular government, state and national, as to conform to the doctrinal and substantial interests of the Protestant Church, would **compel** all other citizens, of whatever faith, or of no doctrinal faith, to help bear the financial burden. They do not effectualize their program in full because they are not permitted to do so. Along the line indicated the Catholics are like the Protestants. Both would coerce, if they could, the people of the United States into full financial support of their theological assumptions—all in violation of the constitution of the United States—all in antagonism to hu-

man liberty. Therefore, it is both the duty and task of Protestants to arouse within themselves their natural sensibilities regarding liberty, justice, fairness and common honesty, challenge the Catholics before all mankind, and proceed about as follows: (1) Take the Bible out of the public schools, declare their ability to take care of the Protestant Bible in their homes, churches and Sunday schools, or other purely religious and self-supporting schools, and **demand** that the Catholics shall absolutely recognize and establish the same limitations. (2) Demand, and demand insistently, that a **purely secular code of sound morals**—a code that would be unqualifiedly endorsed by all sane citizens of average sense and decent deportment, regardless of their religious beliefs—be seriously taught for a given period during every school day. Humanity is woefully in need of instruction in the moralities and virtues, now insufficiently practiced by mankind. The welfare of society absolutely depends upon such instruction and it should, therefore, be made a prominent part of public school work. (3) Demand that no religious propaganda of any description be permitted to be in any way associated with public school work. The enforcement of the demands stated would reduce the validity of all Catholic argument against the public schools to a mass of inconsequential fragments. The augmentation of the strength and influence of the Protestant Church depends to a very considerable extent upon the performance of tasks and duties in harmony with justness, fairness and honesty, with whatever is right in all religions, and with whatever subserves the welfare of humanity. The common sense, common honesty, and justice naturally invested in mankind are the supporting pillars of any form of civilization entitled to respect and consideration.

In so far as individuals, or society as a whole, exhibit

in any particular more dishonesty and injustice than honesty and justice, in that particular they are destructive, not constructive in character. In that particular their influence is demolishing that which is good and building up that which is evil. Now, it is a glaring fact, whether generally so recognized by Protestants and Catholics or not, that the non-taxation of church properties, and all real estate utilized for the support of ecclesiasticism, is evidence of rank injustice and utter selfishness. If Protestants were required to pay tax upon their church properties, while Catholics were exempted from tax upon all their church edifices, there would likely ensue revolution and bloodshed. As tax laws now exist the church holdings of both Catholics and Protestants are free from tax. Whatever of antagonism exists between them in many particulars, all bask serene and content on the common ground of non-taxable church property. However, Catholics and Protestants alike enjoy religious and property protection of secular government, and rightly so, to the same extent as do many millions of other citizens who do not accept the theological doctrines of supernaturalism, and who are not allowed exemption from taxation. This manifestly unequal and unjust application of secular power is iniquitous and should not be tolerated by the American people, whatever the pretentions and virtually unsupported claims of ecclesiaticism. The non-taxation of church property is an unjustifiable subjection of right to the power of might. What justice is there in laws that compel millions of good citizens to pay annually great sums of money that should be paid by those who claim to derive great comfort and satisfaction from their particular forms of religious faith? None at all. Politicians and lawmakers by reason of their ignorance of the principles of justice, and their reprehensible cowardice—particularly their cowardice

—will maintain this foul injustice until Protestants and their friends unite and demand its obliteration. It should not be within the province of the Protestant Church to make moral cowards of lawmakers. But it is clearly within its province to assist in upholding justice, honesty and fairness.

It is also the task of the Protestant Church of the present and future to discountenance effectively the vanities, vulgarities and snobbery arising from the extravagances of wealth as practiced by those who can and those who cannot afford to pay the price. The flummeries, if not indecencies, of the rich will always be aped by a certain proportion of those of moderate or small financial means. While it is not the business of the Protestant Church to indulge in tirades against wealth, honestly obtained, it is its business to practice within the scope of its influence the democracy in the teachings ascribed to Christ—and not prostitute saving principles of government by catering and bowing to the extravagances and snobbery of wealth. It is the work of the Protestant Church to attract all people, whatever their station in life, increase their store of knowledge, help them in their weakness and encourage them to lead upright lives. This is the crucial test of church work.

The Protestant Church of to-day needs very much the intellectual, moral and financial support of those who are outside the church. This support can largely be secured in the course of time by the exercise of reason on the part of Protestants and the wider application of such influences as are indisputably good and helpful within the church in unison with the good intentions and purposes of all good men and women, now without the church. How? By making every church edifice in every community an attractive and influential centre of moral, intellectual, and social progress; by

encouraging admissions to church membership regardless of the personal beliefs and unbeliefs of all who are endeavoring to lead good and useful lives, and stimulating them to attain helpful and noble purposes; by making church buildings the centres of various forms of rational enjoyment and recreation. There are millions of young men and women in the United States who are in **need** of the influences thus outlined, and they can be brought to identify themselves directly with the Protestant Church in no other way than by the attraction of the influences noted. Dogmas and doctrines have been on trial for centuries. Their failure as moral instrumentalities and their retrogressive effects are becoming more and more evident. The power of the Protestant Church is waning. The young men and women of the twentieth century, who reason well and think clearly about what they know, cannot be persuaded or forced seriously to accept dogmas that appear as objectionable or repulsive to them, or be attracted by unsupported claims. Their reason and moral sense await appeal and encouragement. There is a mighty work for the Protestant Church to accomplish if it will courageously contemplate existing human conditions and act accordingly along the lines indicated. Is it not the urgent task of the Protestant Church to extend to all outside the church the strong hand of sincere human fellowship and solicit their united support in making the earth a better and happier abiding place—without stipulating the acceptance of theological conjectures as a condition of church membership—and to make all churches centres of intellectual and moral enlightenment and social betterment? This may sound obsurd and quite presumptuous to those theologians who **feel** themselves to be absolutely convinced respecting their claims to supernatural wisdom. But, has it not occurred to them that they are losing their hold?

Must the Protestant Church fall into decay because of their sincerity in believing that which is being gradually doomed to repudiation by advancing human thought? They can no more stay evolutionary progress than walk without legs. Whatever their attitude may be in contemplating the future, it is respectfully suggested that orthodox Protestants, habituated to certain beliefs, should by no means be expected to relinquish any faith or belief in supernaturalism from which they derive comfort and consolation, but that such faith or belief should be strictly regarded as their personal, private affair. In the Protestant Church of the future all members, believers and unbelievers, should be required to respect alike those of honest belief and those of honest unbelief in supernaturalism. All are flesh and blood; all are of the earth, earthly; all must suffer the sorrows of living. Why not therefore all unite for the earthly welfare of all? What argument is there to the contrary?

The Protestant Church of the future—if it is to have a future worth while—must be largely stripped of the influence of presumptuous and tyrannical bigotry; stripped of the barnacles of fanaticism; stripped of its intrusive interference with secular rights. Sanctimonious cant and intermeddling invite the repudiation and condemnation of mankind. All pious claims should not be permitted to escape rigid analysis at the bar of reason, common sense and common justice. If the Protestant Church cannot exist without the support of special and unwarranted secular legislation to uphold and enforce its presumptuous supernatural claims it deserves to die. The pomposity of pious egoism lacks the elements of abiding strength.

The Protestant Church must seek to establish a kingdom of heaven on earth. This consideration must clearly transcend all conjectural faiths. It must

frankly and forcefully contend that future existence beyond the grave—if such there be—would be a most miserable farce without all the really essential elements of natural goodness, right, justice and virtue which now adorn mankind; to contend that one world is all that the finite mortals of earth can ever hope to attend to effectively in obtaining results beneficial to mankind; and that, therefore, purely earthly considerations are first, last, and all the time, of greatest importance and consequence. These contentions can be efficiently maintained without requiring any individual to sacrifice any faith concerning realms of the unknown that may afford comfort or satisfaction, provided all individuals are equally and cheerfully privileged to entertain the faith or belief of their own liking. But the subjection of faith respecting the unknown and unproven to what is known and proven is vitally essential to lasting human progress.

The Protestant Church of the future will be expected to encourage the worship of the beautiful and sublime in Nature and stimulate inquiry into natural processes; to worship the good in mankind and shun evil, and in all respects and by all available means do its part in establishing, in so far as it is possible to do so, a kingdom of heaven on earth, as the sanest and most effective preparation for whatever may be claimed to be the portion of humanity beyond the activities of the life that now is. No heaven can be established anywhere in the boundlessness of space without Reason, Truth, Love, Justice and Charity, because any abode for humanity, not in large part characterized by what these terms denote, would be hell, not heaven.

What the world needs most and must need most in all future time is the union, upon common ground, of all reasonable, right doing men and women to battle for the enlightenment and uplift of the hu-

man race **for this world,** in opposition to all influences which make for the downfall of man and the destruction of civilized society. It is of little consequence what a man believes, or disbelieves, provided his acts and deeds comport with sound natural morality, and provided further he has sense enough to fully accord to others the privilge to choose their own beliefs and insist upon right-living on the part of all. It is the God or good in man that requires worshipping. It is the Devil or evil in man that needs to be held under control and subdued. The conflict is unceasing. The highest possible destiny of the human race absolutely depends upon the victorious domination of the good and benign influences of mankind in the struggle against all that is evil and destructive. The Protestant Church, or any other religious organization, can possess itself of no higher or nobler ambition than the wish to perform its part in discharging the paramount obligations arising from purely human relationships and in enlisting all its energies in good and helpful service in behalf of all mankind.

IDEAS OF GOD

All gods and devils are the verbalized expressions of the human brain in its attempts to furnish a priori causes for the existence of opposing influences cognized by the senses. All notions concerning gods and devils —from simple to more conjecturally complex—represent succeeding changes in accordance with the natural evolution of ideas. These changes are traced to beginnings of primitive human observation and reflection, to the time when the phenomena arising from the conflict of natural elements impressed the brain of man and caused the imaginative creation of good and evil spirits, and the subsequent investment of these spirits with the various parts and attributes of animals, man included. There were no gods and devils prior to the evolution of man.

Nature afforded the material and the precise and complex processes of movement that eventuated in the evolution of man, and all conjectures respecting the fancied existence of good and evil spirits, gods and devils, were expressive of similar and differing states of brain matter. Primitive man was strongly impressed by phenomenal influences to which he was constantly subjected. He did not understand them, causatively. He saw the lightning flash, heard the thunder roar, crouched before tempests, and was appalled by other manifestations of the elements. Crudely he worshipped influences which seemed good and helpful to him and

deeply feared influences dangerous and destructive, from which he instinctively shrank and sought protection. Evidently, he loved light and heat and feared darkness and cold. Later man, within the historical period, has exhibited the same emotions of credulity and fear, modified in form and expression, as those of his remote ancestors; has taken similar recognition of influences determinative of his weal or woe, and created good and evil spirits, gods and devils. Ideas of god or devil, evolved by the human brain, in a measure gave expression to the varying character of the individuals who conjectured them. The gods of the older religions have been very numerous, many of them being the deification of extraordinary persons once existing, or reputed to have existed, in the flesh. Hebrew conceptions of God, in most part at least, are anthropomorphic, picturing a God with all the attributes common to humanity; a God of hate, love, vengeance, mercy, cruelty, justice and injustice; a God obviously reflecting the thoughts, wishes, fears and hopes of those who fear and worship—of those who expect the help of their God in all their undertakings, good and evil. The God of Christendom continues to be Hebraic in character, with Christ as an intermediary agent between God and man. Those who believe in the God of the Bible, or in the Trinitarian Godhead, continue to fashion their God in the image of man and associate with that image extended human characteristics and purposes. It therefore happens that the character of God depends much upon the temperament and disposition of the individual believer. The believer inclined to be merciful and compassionate will almost invariably possess a belief in and worship a "God of mercy and compassion." The believer who has much of the dogmatic and revengeful mixed with his believing and thinking usually invokes the wrath and vengeance of

his God upon those considered wicked and upon unbelievers in his God. Those who have more of loving kindness than of hate for their fellow mortals ever incline to worship a God of love. These varying attitudes of believers are a matter of common observation to those who have given any attention to the psychology of religious beliefs.

As previously indicated, the term God, or its equivalent, has been associated with the myriad efforts of humanity to account for the earth, man and all other existences; to centralize all causation in a supreme personality, or knowing power, the character of the correlative attributes implied by the term depending upon the notions of crass ignorance — or the alluring mysticisms and assumptions of more educated and refined believers. The cause-efficient of all ideas of God is the universally recognized subjection of individuals and races to a power that immeasurably transcends the potentialities of human and other existences. While unbiased observers and students of Nature discern an **impersonal** power as inherent in or expressive of the processes, orderly and precise, of moving matter, those bound by theological cogitations conjecturally create an extraneous God of **magnified human attributes.** In one form or another theological concepts of God are prevalent and will obviously continue to exist indefinitely—because of the vested interests of exponents and supporters of supernaturalism. These interests require all manner of theological effort designed to halt progress along any line of investigation that threatens analysis of supernaturalistic claims. The average devotee, under the influence and direction of orthodox ecclesiasticism, readily adopts and adheres to anthropomorphic and Trinitarian ideas of God without question. The orthodox God idea, however unsusceptible of intelligible definition, will indefinitely persist because it

has been and will continue to be sustained by influential supporters of supernaturalistic theology thriving in the domain of credulity. Those who are educated to believe in miracles and miraculous conceptions find it rather easy to mock reason and claim a monopoly of the gracious gifts of their God and paradise. This kind of education maintains a fruitful field for the growth of opposition to rational knowledge, for theological exponents bent upon closing avenues of information not in harmony with their particular system of outlining the designs of their God and of invoking blessings for the faithful in credulity and curses for unbelievers. To expect rapid changes in environmental influence with relation to popular God ideas is to invite disappointment—is to underestimate the grip of the theological vise upon the credulities, the hopes and the fears of humanity enroute from the cradle to the grave. But theological conceptions of God are passing, even though slowly. Perhaps, in the course of centuries, there will come a transference of the application of the term God from an extraneous and personified God to a God inherent in humanity and entirely expressive of natural and constructive influences.

A RATIONALISTIC IDEA OF GOD

A rationalistic idea or concept of God involves the following fundamental and other considerations: The processes of Nature are constructive and destructive. Through constructive processes our earth came into existence as part of the solar system. No doubt at some future time—nobody can tell when—it will become disintegrated by destructive processes into the nebular or attenuated form of matter from which it was derived. Our earth is perhaps, comparatively speaking, young. Nature as a whole takes no account of the youth, middle life, or old age of planets, or of all other

existences. Natural processes go on and on, eternally. Human existence is only one of the multifarious resultants of these processes. The constructive process builds up, the destructive tears down. When the individual begins to live, as such, the individual begins to die. Organic life is the phenomenal expression of opposing influences—constructive and destructive. Just so with all the activities of the human organism. Therefore all constructive influences are to be considered as promotive of love, reason, truth, justice, goodness, usefulness, helpfulness, happiness and all truly benign influences of whatever character; influences which advantageously affect the lives of individuals, the life of society, the life of nations. All these influences a Rationalist chooses to group under one head or one term—God! Wherever there are throughout the universe constructive processes, there also is the Rationalist's God—co-eternal with matter. A Rationalist's God is a God of Love, Reason, Truth, Right, Justice, Goodness, Happiness, and of every influence whatsoever that contributes to the welfare of all mankind! A Rationalist can conceive of no other God. In so far as he conforms his life to all the constructive influences relating to human existence he is in harmony with his God—in rythmic harmony with the constructive power of the universe! When not in harmony with his God he is allied with destructive influences and is more or less in partnership with evil, as are all his fellow mortals at times—in association with the Evil or Devil in human nature. The Rationalist is well persuaded by known facts to conclude that, should what is naturally and humanly destructive or evil dominate mankind as a whole for any length of time, the human race would rush to destruction. Therefore he worships the God in human nature and, if he is a good Rationalist, he strives to conform his life to a Rationalistic conception of God,

without selfish anticipation of reward or fear of punishment in a hypothetical hereafter. He is chiefly concerned about the consequential effects of his deeds, good and evil, here and now. One world at a time, and more of heaven and less of hell on earth being his chief concern, he takes account of the necessity of shunning hell as much as possible. Moreover reverence for his God requires him to be wholly engaged, now and here, with the real earthly affairs of this life only; and he regards a hypothetical future life—about which he knows nothing—as entirely beyond the realm of known realities.

Objectors to a Rationalistic conception of God, as outlined in the preceding paragraph, are respectfully advised that followers of science and rationalists must accept the fact, verified by historical and scientific evidence, that all ideas relating to supernatural gods and saviours are the products of the human brain; that a personal God has been created by man himself in the image of man, and that the man-animal has been notoriously inclined to estimate the purposes of his God from human view-points. It does not follow, however, that naturalists and rationalists must refuse to adopt the use of the term "God," or the God-idea, radically changed in character by rational enlightenment in the domain of demonstrable knowledge. Not at all. It is their privilege to philosophically excuse the monopolists of paradise and the formulators of hell for unbelievers and infidels and conform their God to the requirements of common sense, to the facts of human existence, of the rationalism which recognizes the universal brotherhood of man, the common destiny of the race and the oneness of the universe. Thus rationalists are obliged to reject all anthropomorphic and "spiritual" ideas of God and supernaturalistic assumptions. But they are required to recognize and reverence the

influences involved in the processes of Nature which make for Reason, Truth, Goodness, Justice, Love and all other helpful and humanly benign agencies—in their united potentialities—as constituting their concept of God! Moreover, the practical application of their concept of God enables them to assist actually in ushering in a kingdom of heaven on earth and in augmenting the righteous power of **a natural religion of service to humanity.** Their concept of God avoids the necessity of accentuating their self-importance, or of thriving upon the weaknesses, credulities, fears and hopes of mankind.

IMMORTALITY

The term immortality expresses a widely popular belief in the continued, never-ending existence of the human individual after death; the logic of the Christian conception being the preservation of personality. The New Testament narrative of the bodily resurrection of Jesus on the third day after crucifixion and of his ascension into heaven, forms the basis of the belief in immortality as an essential doctrine of orthodox Christianity.

It is altogether suggestive that the Hebrews of the Old Testament had only a very vague, if any, conception relating to immortality. Job asked the question: "If a man die, shall he live again?" He made no attempt to answer affirmatively. In fact he took a negative view when he philosophized thus:

"There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again. * * * Though the root thereof was old and the stock thereof die in the ground, yet through the scent of water it will bud and bring forth boughs like a plant. But man dieth and wasteth away. Yea, man giveth up the ghost and where is he?" William Frederic Bade in his "The Old Testament in the Light of To-day" pp. 147-148, says: "It requires considerable familiarity with ancient modes of thought to remain conscious of the fact that no ancient Hebrew practiced religion in order to save his soul, in the New Testament sense of that expression. He would have

understood and used the phrase in the sense of prolonging life on earth, that being the chief benefit which he anticipated from the faithful performance of religious duties. True, he believed in a shadowy existence beyond the grave. But he had no expectation of a future life in which Javeh might reward his virtues or punish his sins. Sheol was a cheerless and shadowy place where neither rewards nor punishments were distributed. Hence the religious economy of the Old Testament concerns itself solely with man's earthly life. Only in the land of the living can the worshipper maintain relations with the deity, or become the object of his regard."

In part at least, Christianity derived the idea or belief in immortality, as well as the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, from Persian sources. However derived, and however they came to be accentuated by the story of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, the belief in immortality, and the doctrine of rewards and punishments, have proven to be a powerful asset to orthodox Christianity. They have been assiduously cultivated because of the influential character of their hold upon the fears, hopes and credulities of mankind. Orthodox Christianity promises immortality for the individual, anticipates future rewards for the righteous, and predicates eternal punishment for the wicked "beyond the sowing and reaping" of earthly life. It caters to hope and utilizes fear. It offers rewards hereafter for those who accept the doctrine of "salvation by faith" and consigns those who have no faith in Christ as the saviour of mankind to eternal misery.

Conscious of human inequalities, conscious of the effects of goodenss and wickedness, conscious of justice and injustice in human affairs, believers conjecturally associate with immortality various states of future existence to harmonize, as it were, with earthly experi-

ences. Pious individuals can find no comfort in anticipating everlasting association with those deemed wicked; therefore abodes different in character are expected hereafter.

Belief in immortality, though by no means universal, is not confined to any particular race or religion. Beliefs in ghosts, spirits, the abodes of the gods and paradise, which exhibit various extravagances and shades of the human imagination, are traced far back in the history of mankind. The earlier exponents of orthodox Christianity evidently understood their significance and importance as contributing instrumentalities in the rapid propagation and absorption of their dogmas and doctrines. Modern adherents of orthodox Christianity are not unmindful of the present efficacy of ancient instrumentalities.

The genesis of belief in immortality is unquestionably rooted in the naturally innate love of life and fear of death. There are good psychological reasons in support of the conclusion that, as man in course of evolutionary development became conscious of the meaning of death—as the end of his earthly activities—he came to love life and fear death more abundantly. The progressive evolution of mankind required the existence of both instinctive and conscious love of life and fear of death. Thus the love of life and the fear of death became closely associated states of brain matter. It is noteworthy that there exists much difference in individuals respecting both the love of life and the fear of death. Those in whom these forms of love and fear are strong, or even of average strength, rarely commit suicide, because they are sustained by such influences amid all manner of adversity and suffering. They repel the suicidal mania, if not other forms of mental disturbance. A weakness of love of life lessens the fear of death and precludes much con-

cern about immortality, and, under depressing influences, encourages self-destruction of the individual.

The egoism of man has accentuated rather than retarded the belief in immortality. Many persons believe in immortality because they feel that the compensations of this life do not balance the sufferings and sorrows of human existence; that the righteous must suffer, just like the wicked, and that very frequently the wicked escape much that falls upon the righteous and that, therefore, there **must** be continued existence for mortals in some form or other beyond the grave, where there will be a balancing of accounts, where the ills of this life will be no more. This feeling comes quite naturally. But mere feeling that this or that belief must be true does not establish the evidential validity of belief. Associated with man's enlarged estimate of his importance is the very potent element of human selfishness, which is as strongly manifested in religion as in other affairs of life.

The belief in immortality, like many other beliefs devoid of basic evidence, affords latitude for what may be termed correlated conjectures respecting the character of existence awaiting the individual beyond the woes and joys of the present life. Relative conditions, altogether resulting from natural processes, and alike real to all mankind, exist here and now. The happiness and misery experienced are the resultants of the conditions noted. Without unhappiness, happiness could not be appreciated. Without happiness, unhappiness would not be recognized. To imagine a state of eternal happiness leads to further imagining as to how the monotony of eternal sameness could be enjoyed, or even endured. What earthly enjoyment is there that, if continued beyond a limited period of time, does not become wearisome? Do not the successive changes in the various activities of existence make life endurable

here? When thoughtfully considered the belief in immortality invites numerous questions for which there are obviously no solutions. It is very true that mankind on earth might well be spared at times a preponderance of pain, misery and sorrow, but is it not also true that since very much of the pain, misery and sorrow are traceable to human ignorance and wickedness, to inadequate information respecting the causes of destroying diseases, the application of higher standards of morality and advancing scientific knowledge afford hope for brighter and better days in the future? And is it not also true that the transmission of good and benign potencies from individual to individual, and from generation to generation immortalize, in a sense at least, the influences of the individual who exerts them while living here? Why, therefore, indulge in imagination or mere belief to the point of interfering with the fulfillment of the very essential and needful requirements of present existence—to the point of retarding the work of alleviating human conditions here and now? Notwithstanding these considerations, it is a matter of common observation that even those who indicate a strong belief in immortality, and confidence in the promise of bliss hereafter, manifest the same concern for their physical well-being and for the prolongation of their earthly life as do those who rarely exhibit any interest in such belief.

It is of interest to note the attitude of orthodox Christians (Catholics and Protestants) toward Spiritualists—the disciples of Emanuel Swedenborg. The Spiritualists are frequently derided because of their "delusions," "spirit-rappings" and "communications with departed spirits." To dispassionate minds, not inclined to either orthodoxy or Spiritualism, both appear to be equally conjectural and unfounded. Whatever of difference exists favors the Spiritualists who at least at-

tempt to associate some ordinary sense and humane feeling with their belief by postulating that the spirit of the individual after its departure from the flesh will have opportunity for advancement and betterment; that even the wicked will have a chance to advance from lower to higher planes in spirit life. Spiritualists affirm that right living here constitutes the best preparation for advanced spiritual existence hereafter. The orthodox Christians continue to associate immortality with "future rewards and punishments"—heaven for faithful believers and hell for the wicked or whomsoever they may regard as not fitted for or deserving of the joys of heaven. It appears as though, from their conjectural view-point, there will be no chance for the wicked and unbelieving to escape from punishment hereafter except by mending their ways and accepting the saving religious creeds now current on earth. Therefore it would seem that the Spiritualists are at least mercifully considerate and not disposed to make the after life for the greater portion of humanity one of uninterrupted and eternal misery.

* * * *

Rationalists neither affirm nor deny immortality. They believe that, if there be immortal life for the individual, it must be a fact in Nature. They affirm that there now exists no valid evidence wherewith to establish such fact. They are compelled to aver that the findings of science, thus far, entirely fail to support the belief in continued human life beyond earthly activities. The present conclusion of science is sustained by all that is scientifically known of the phenomena of organic matter. When the organism itself ceases to exist its manifestations of soul, or of life, cease. Though the matter that composes the organism—in common with all matter—is indestructible and therefore eternal in its existence, the phenomenon of individual life is quite

transitory. It is not, primarily, the task of science to encourage or discourage a belief in immortality. It is always the task of science to discern factual knowledge and organize it and make it accessible to mankind. Science will always be quite ready and willing to consider evidence respecting immortality. Furthermore, science has no issue with those who are happier with than without such belief. It is their rightful privilege, and so long as they do not insist that others shall believe as they do, they are strictly within the bounds of propriety. They are not at all obliged to accept Lord Byron's view "that we are miserable enough in this life without the absurdity of speculating upon another. If men are to live, why die at all? And if they die, why disturb the sound sleep that knows no waking. * * * All are inclined to believe what they covet, from a lottery ticket to a passport in paradise; in which, from description, I see nothing very tempting. * * * I see no horror in a dreamless sleep."

* * * *

Many leaders and devotees of orthodox Christianity frequently express fear with reference to the effects upon humanity of a possible loss of the beliefs in immortality and a personal God. This fear occasions anticipation of calamitous consequences. Their outlook upon some waning religious beliefs is not shared by those who find themselves impelled by reason of serious investigation to maintain that the beliefs in immortality and a personal God **do not constitute** the true sources of moral incentives and conduct. Moreover, the direful consequences anticipated by believers are due to the absence of an appreciation of some of the hard facts of existence established by experience. The highest standards of morality are attained by a clear recognition of the natural relationships and the grave obligations and duties necessarily arising from those

relationships. To maintain that beliefs, unsupported by the facts of our present and very real existence are essential to permanent human goodness and happiness is to imply unmistakably the measurement of goodness and happiness, or of good and evil, not by the natural consequences of efficient natural causes, but by the acceptance of popular beliefs having no evidential support. The influence of such implication upon humanity is disastrous and destructive in character, because it substitutes blind faith for evidence and dethrones reason. James H. Leuba, in his enlightening volume "The Belief in God and Immortality," page 323, says: "Our alleged essential dependence upon transcendental beliefs is belied by the most common experiences of daily life. Who does not feel the absurdity of the opinion that the lavish care for a sick child by a mother is given because of a belief in God and immortality. Are love of father and mother on the part of children, affection and serviceableness between brothers and sisters, straightforwardness and truthfulness between business men essentially dependent upon these beliefs? What sort of person would be the father who would announce divine punishment or reward in order to obtain the love and respect of his children? And if there are business men preserved from unrighteousness by the fear of future punishment, they are far more numerous who are deterred by the threat of human law. Most of them would take their chances with heaven a hundred times before they would once with society, or perchance with the imperative voice of humanity heard in the conscience." Rightful human action finds its determining causes in the heredity and rationally moral training of the individual. This fact, elucidated by all that is known of biology, physiology, and psychology, is either wilfully, or ignorantly overlooked by many of the propagandists and devotees of some religious beliefs. Once

this fact becomes truly appreciated and applied, and popularized among the masses of mankind, the general welfare of the human race will be much more broadened, elevated, and sustained than is now evidenced by the present stage of civilization.

* * * *

The following lines are excerpted from a lecture on immortality delivered by that great genius of human thought and expression, Robert G. Ingeresoll who, though dead, lives in the grateful memories of many thousands of mankind:

"One world at a time. That is my doctrine. * * * Upon the shadowy shore of death the sea of trouble casts no wave. Eyes that have been curtained by the everlasting dark will never know the burning touch of tears. Lips touched by eternal silence will never utter again the broken words of grief. Hearts of dust do not break. The dead do not weep. Within the tomb no veiled and sleeping sorrow sits, and in the rayless gloom is crouched no shuddering fear. I would rather think of those I have loved and lost, as having returned to earth, as having become a part of the elemental wealth of the world; I would rather think of them as gurgling in the stream, floating in the clouds, bursting into light upon the shores of other worlds; I would rather think of them as the last visions of a forgotten night than have even the faintest fear that their naked souls have been clutched by an orthodox god. But as for me, I will leave the dead where nature leaves them. Whatever flower of hope springs in my heart I will cherish. I will give it breath of sighs and rain of tears."

EDUCATION

To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge.—HERBERT SPENCER.

In a basic sense the term education denotes the training and utilization of the various functions of the human organism. True education implies the direction of organic activities along such lines as will most adequately enable the individual to meet the physical, intellectual, moral and social requirements of existence and ensure the well-being, happiness and progress of the units of society, and of society as a whole.

Any form or scheme of education which fails to equip the individual with the knowledge required to discharge effectively the manifold duties and obligations of life may be justly regarded as either false or seriously defective. Assuming the further progress of humanity, during the present and future centuries, education will ultimately be placed upon a purely scientific basis, toward which the most progressive educators are now directing their attention. Meanwhile advancement will be relatively slow, because of the natural tenacity of conservative habits of thought, imperfect methods and faulty instruction, and the influence of fossilized, though popular, theories based upon mere assumptions.

To ring true to all that is best and noblest in human nature and to all that relates to the universal welfare of mankind, education must comprise the acquire-

ment of verified knowledge respecting all the known phenomena of Nature, the natural relationships existing between family units and the units of society, and the various intellectual, utilitarian and moral obligations arising from those relationships. Furthermore, true education must always and everywhere comprehend the efficient training of hand and brain for useful and helpful service in harmony with the **natural inclinations and capabilities of the individual,** and the vital importance of the consideration that all needful and legitimate forms of labor of hand or brain are alike honorable. Much that now passes for education, in a popular as well as in a more restricted sense, tends rather to educate the usefulness out of the younger portion of mankind than to qualify the oncoming generation to best discharge various future obligations and duties. Throughout Nature there are no two vegetable and animal organisms exactly alike in form, structure and characteristics. It follows, therefore, that there must be vast room for wide differences between individuals. These differences become quite apparent to those who endeavor to discern them. Nevertheless, educators are prone to proceed with their methods and instructions as though their pupils were all about equally endowed by Nature to accomplish equally well the multifarious kinds of labor necessary to sustain human existence. Consequently, where educational methods and the character of instruction are not fairly well adapted to the natural inclinations and capabilities of the individual, a considerable amount of wasted time and energy, and of subsequent inefficiency, must inevitably result. Thus are the numerous misfits in the complex industrial and social life of a nation readily accounted for—in so far as educational methods and instruction are concerned.

The educational training of pupils in the public

schools of the United States should by all means and always comprehend not only basic essentials and scientific methods, but also the application of every effort calculated to stimulate free and untrammeled thinking. The mere memorization of the contents of text-books falls far short of a high standard of school work and encourages imperfect, superficial and incoherent thinking. The first absolute requisite of popular educational systems as well as of all other systems of instruction, should relate to the fitness of teachers to think clearly, to analyze subjects taught, to inspire their pupils to discern and consider whys and wherefores and seek verified facts and profit by them. Much of that which is at present involved in popular education merely comprises memory practices and tests, devoid of reflective thinking, because many teachers evidently fail to comprehend the future utilitarian and practical needs of those entrusted to their tutorship. Again, true popular education is retarded by the constant intrusion of fads, fancies, and attractions which cause the loss of valuable time. The importance of imparting disciplinary, enlightening and useful knowledge to youthful minds cannot be overestimated. Therefore, too much emphasis cannot be placed upon thoroughness of instruction in all branches of study. Artificialities and all other educational rubbish should be discarded. Pupils should be encouraged to study assiduously, think accurately, and reason clearly, within the limits of their individual capacities.

The facts of science, and the true logic of such facts, respecting the various phenomena of Nature, including all vegetable and animal life, and so graded from simple to more complex presentations as to make them attractive to pupils in various departments, should receive serious attention and effort in every public school. Since the progress and perpetuity of civiliza-

tion absolutely depend upon the intellectual and moral education of the masses such education must needs be based upon the real and verified facts of human existence, upon natural relationship and the obligations associated therewith. Many of the duties of life are of a serious character because they relate directly and indirectly to the advancement of all that must continue as highest and best in civilization. The solidarity of society depends upon the discharge of serious obligations and duties on the part of the individuals and of society. Therefore, at least the necessary preliminary knowledge relating to such duties and obligations should form a part of public school instruction. Failure in this respect can justly be regarded as a grievous reflection upon all who are responsible for the educational training of those who must in due course of time encounter the inevitable responsibilities of adult life.

The intrusion of purely ecclesiastical assumptions in the domain of popular education (supported by public funds) has always been and always will be associated with dangerous influences—dangerous because they are misleading, unreliable, retrogressive, and destructive. Any statement, claim, or opinion that will not survive analysis at the bar of rational evidence should not be permitted to befuddle and misguide the impressionable minds of public school pupils. The legitimate work of the public schools is of a distinctly intellectual, moral and utilitarian character—of a character which will most thoroughly educate our boys and girls to become well informed and useful members of society, thus fitting them to sustain the higher standards of citizenship and civilization. This work requires capable teachers, scientific methods, uniformity of thoroughly-tested text-book standards, and sound and virile **moral instruction.**

Our public schools should never become popular centres for parading styles in dress; for the cultivation of social fads and extravagances which interfere with the accomplishment of genuinely effective school work.

* * * *

The considerations previously applied to the educational work of the public schools pertain in a larger and wider sense to all higher institutions of learning, the majority of which continue to be dominated by ecclesiastical influences associated with the dogmatic and creedal conjectures of supernaturalism. In numerous instances, largely inclusive of sectarian institutions, assumptions entirely unsupported by rational evidence are accentuated in one department of instruction, while in other departments it continues to be disadvantageous to the personal and pecuniary interests of instructors to dwell directly upon the inexorable logic of such scientific facts as may form a part of the curriculum. In fact text-books which fail to gloss over such scientific evidence as might disturb the contentment and assumed sureness of theological exponents and their followers, are frequently tabooed as dangerously heretical. While, in a general way many facts of science, for obvious reasons, are permitted to be imparted to students, watchful concern is exercised lest too much emphasis be placed upon the disturbing findings of science. All such attempts to blend, educationally, facts and conjectures in the furtherance of intellectual and disciplinary enlightenment must retard the progress of true education because immature minds are either dwarfed or unsettled by contradictory elements of instruction, however lightly and cursorily some of the elements may be treated.

Educational training respecting rational, mundane, verified knowledge if, in part, it is not to be regarded as fraudulent, must be stripped of mystifying and be-

fogging influences arising from bigoted insistence upon the reality of unfounded conjectures. A clear line of demarcation must be drawn between facts and truths amply supported by scientific evidence and the groundlessness of pure assumptions and hallucinations. In other words, students at colleges and universities are by nature, and by the constructive sanity of civilization, invested with certain moral rights, which include the **right to protection** from the controlling influences of superstition and error boldly masquerading in the garb of truth and exercised in prostituting factual knowledge for the purpose of affording continued support to delusive vagaries of the human brain. In this connection it is in place to observe that the subjection of educational training in certain institutions, heavily endowed by the possessors of great wealth, to the crude and fossilized economic and social ideas of so-called benefactors of humanity, constitutes one of the blighting hindrances to the progress of true education. Wealth thus bestowed retards the forward, evolutionary strides of genuine advancement and becomes in effect subversive of the best and most abiding interests of mankind, however much the names of contributing benefactors are exalted in popular esteem.

Inasmuch as true education and its consequent effects must denote the dissemination and application of scientific knowledge derived from the verified facts of human existence, and of all the hereditary and environmental influences potentially affecting humanity, it obviously follows that such education must distinctly and emphatically relate to the physical, rationally intellectual, and moral improvement of the individual units of society. Upon such improvement depend all the advances of humanity toward the highest possible destiny of our race.

GOVERNMENT

It is not the purpose of this essay to trace the evolution of government from its rudimentary beginnings prior to the earlier civilizations of the human race in different parts of the earth, or to endeavor to describe various movements of mankind, from family units, tribes and clans toward more complex civilizing agencies, which established such lines of action and conduct on the part of individuals as were found by experience to be essential to the preservation of life and other vital interests of earlier humanity.

The concluding pages of this volume will be devoted to considerations respecting principles of government within the United States, to the political system related to the application of those principles, and sundry thoughts anent the dangers which threaten the perpetuity of a "government of, for, and by the people," the chief function of which is the protection of the lives, rights and just liberties of the people in whom is vested governing power. The theoretical principles of what is termed Democracy, practically and efficiently applied, obviously require intellectual and moral fitness on the part of the people themselves, individually and collectively. The people's government necessarily reflects the rational enlightenment and the application of the principles of right and justice which characterize the lives and actions of the people during any period of government. The existing tyrannies of Democracy which in their effects frequently approximate the tyrannies of Autocracy are distinctly traceable to the ig-

norance and indifference of the electorate relating to the meaning and import of the term liberty, as well as of principles of justice which cannot be largely disregarded without the entailment of serious consequences upon the governed. Therefore, in the last analysis, the permanent success of Democratic government depends upon the adequate fitness of the people to govern themselves. To be thus fitted they must be qualified to discharge certain essential obligations necessarily arising from the very nature of the government they have adopted. In so far as the theory of their government fails of materialization they must look to themselves for instrumentalities whereby success may be substituted for failure.

The Federal government centered at Washington since the early days of national life, and the governing power of the States of the Federation, as well as local government, in their operations, gave rise to the formation of political parties to express and effectualize differences of opinion concerning various branches of government, including legislative, executive, judicial and economic functions. In large measure the continued existence of the people's government requires the maintenance of two or more political parties. Such aggregations of the electorate are a necessity, a blessing, and a curse. Support of this apparently paradoxical statement is embodied in the following observations: Political parties are a necessity and a blessing because they afford the people avenues for the free expression of their convictions and opinions respecting the administration of the affairs of their government, and because such freedom of expression encourages the formulation of diverging opinions, and discussion. Private and public expression of thought promote general enlightenment regarding ways and means related to policies associated with the discharge of governmental

functions. Political parties are a curse because they afford numerous crafty politicians diverse opportunities to advance the purely selfish interests of their parties and of themselves, thus diminishing the welfare of the people and vitiating public service. One of the execrable specimens of humanity is the partisan politician masquerading as a statesman and practicing in public life the delusive tricks and subterfuges of some of the ward politicians of misgoverned municipalities. In innumerable instances important interests of the people have been and continue to be adversely subjected to a preponderance of sentiment created by the false claims and clamorings of the leaders of political parties and their followers. The insistence of rancorous partisan politics is a concomitant of American public life that frequently and injuriously affects the functionings of the people's government. The average American politician is a moral coward, made so by political, religious and other prejudices arising from the influences of craftiness, ignorance and false conceptions regarding the principles of Democracy. His ambition to obtain political preferment and the emoluments of office constrain him so to adapt his movements and utterances that they may receive the impetus of popular currents of opinion, however subversive of the public good, or of the rightful liberty of individuals. This observation applies with especial fitness to members of the legislative branches of government. Incompetence and cowardice are frequently responsible for the enactment of laws of a doubtful or vicious character, while antiquated and abominable statutes are neither revised nor repealed because of timorous and incompetent lawmakers elected to represent the people in legislative halls. Obviously, remedial power is vested in the people.

That the governing power, as applied by those chosen to administer it, is often diverted into channels

running counter to the vital and constructive interests of the governed is a fact that does not here require special elucidation. However, this fact does not imply the failure in larger part of our system of government. It rather serves to add emphasis to the conclusion that the extent of wholesome efficiency in the application of governing power inhering in the people must be determined by the people, whose fitness to govern is yet on trial.

An apparent fallacy widely current is that the power of government should be exercised for the elimination of human weaknesses, inefficiencies, and natural inequalities, and that such power should be substituted for individual initiative. The processes of Nature are fixed and irrevocable. The application of government for the purpose of freeing the individual from the effects of natural causes, or to establish equality where no equality exists, is doomed to failure. The government which "governs the least" is likely to be the most effectual because it does not aim to discharge the obligations naturally vested in the individual and naturally discharged by the units of society when untrammeled and **protected in their legitimate struggles for existence and their rightful freedom.** The problem of human existence, or of how to live well, cannot be solved by governmental fiats. The people's government reflects the strength, the weakness, the goodness and wickedness of humanity. It cannot perform the tasks and discharge the responsibilities naturally imposed upon the people. It can only assist the people by **protecting them in their just rights and liberties.**

Among the several outstanding weaknesses of the people's government is the constant and reprehensible utilization of governing power in augmenting the financial interests of individuals, corporations and members of various organizations, which practically amounts to

the exercise of arbitrary power in special support of both capital and labor, and which must commensurately result in banefully retarding the substantial progress of the people as a whole. Another of the weaknesses is the application of governing power in specially and potently furthering the interests of ecclesiasticism by authorizing very unjust tax exemptions, thus in effect and unconstitutionally supporting unproven claims and contentions, not only at the expense of the general public but also to the disadvantage and curtailment of the liberty proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and plainly recognized in the Constitution of the United States. This prostitution of governing power is most unfair and intolerable. It reveals an elementally destructive influence of misgovernment. Considerations suggestive in character and relating to the success and perpetuity of the people's government follow:

The scientific instruction of the masses of the people respecting the natural principles of right and justice, the individual responsibilities arising therefrom, and their application in the administration of all the affairs of government. This rational instruction must comprehend moral as well as intellectual enlightenment and the elimination of glaring inefficiencies in the preparation of the present generation for future citizenship. Since honesty, justice and efficiency in the administration of the various functions of government are dependent upon the intellectual and moral status of the people, from whom governing power is derived, it is the obvious and very serious duty of the Federal government to absolutely require purely moral and civic instruction in every public school in the United States—moral instruction to be based upon the universal experiences of mankind concerning the constructive effects of morality and right living, and the desructive effects of immorality. It should be a chief function of

the government to practically encourage through proper instruction the elimination of ignorance, the substitution of reason for credulity, of justice for injustice, of freedom for tyranny, of the patriotism of right and truth for the pseudo-patriotism of noise and the irresponsible gushing of sentimentality. Such instruction should also fairly and honestly include the more important facts of American history from the beginning of the colonial period to date, without in a partial manner glorifying the heroes of war and bloodshed in the utilization of effort that should, in part at least, be devoted to historical recognition of the courageous performers of the civic duties of worthy citizenship. Historical instruction should be complete, honest and truthful, not evasive and apologetic, or purposely unmindful of the parts sustained by all the more prominent founders of the American Republic. It is a national disgrace and an exhibition of flagrant national dishonesty that the gigantic work of Thomas Paine (who did more with his pen and influence to prepare the colonists for the successful establishment of liberty and independence than any other man) continues to receive scant recognition in popular American histories taught in most sections of the United States, because of the influence of ecclesiastical calumniators and stranglers of truth and justice. In all public school work there must be a thorough, not half-way separation of church and state. All theological influence of a supernaturalistic character must be restricted to purely theological quarters and not be permitted to intrude officiously and openly, or covertly, its influence upon the affairs of secular education. Whether the direction and control of all public school effort should be centered in the Federal government, or not, is quite a mooted question. But respecting adequate instruction in sound morality, true patriotism and the honest and faithful presentation of

all the more important historical facts, the national government should bear a virile and controlling part; and, if need be, give financial support to the states for the purpose of encouraging the dissemination of knowledge related to pure morality and the absolute requirements of true and efficient citizenship.

A grave danger besetting the institutions of Democracy is the **indifference** of the people themselves to the vital importance of the liberties they are enjoying, and to the moral responsibilities associated therewith. Also, to the full and faithful discharge of the elective franchise. This indifference is traced in part to two causes: First, haphazard and **inefficient** instruction in patriotism in our public schools and, second, to meagre instruction in civic duties and morality. Frequent reference is made in popular quarters to the "righteousness that exalteth a nation." Unless this high sounding phrase is employed to denote the natural virtues of right living, the thorough maintenance of high moral standards, and the faithful discharge of the responsible duties of useful and honorable citizenship, it should be catapulted into oblivion. The serious needs of humanity cannot be met by the use of popular phrases of doubtful meaning.

The final test of Democracy will be the final test of the people. The people can survive the test by the sufficient acquirement and application of knowledge rationally intellectual and moral; by the practical observance of the principles of liberty and justice, and by eliminating complex and indirect methods of obtaining an expression of the political opinions and preferences of voters so that electors may be privileged to give expression promptly, directly and clearly to their conclusions regarding all the affairs of government, nation and state. The final test also imposes upon all electors the duty of casting their ballots at all elections. Those who

fail to do so within a stated period, and who are without reasonable excuse, should be permanently deprived of the elective franchise.

Inasmuch as the power of the people's government inheres in the people it must inevitably follow that the failure of Democracy will mean the intellectual and moral unfitness of the people to govern themselves mutually, helpfully and rightfully. Therefore, and finally, every American citizen in whose veins courses the red blood of true manhood and womanhood should clearly recognize and faithfully discharge the serious duties of citizenship, should discountenance false patriotism and hold in contempt all traitors to our beloved country, to the end that the priceless heritage of liberty bequeathed to succeeding generations by our heroic and self-sacrificing forefathers shall never be lightly esteemed, and that the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper proce
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Feb. 2005

PreservationTechnologie
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATI
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 805 620 A